Course-Section: CHEM 100 0101 Title

THE CHEMICAL WORLD

CARPENTER, TARA

Instructor: Enrollment: 63 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 191 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

				Frequencies I			Tngi	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect		
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	10	9	4.17	991/1504	4.17	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.17
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	692/1503	4.38	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.38
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	8	12	4.17	853/1290	4.17	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.17
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	2	4	9	5	3.85	1136/1453	3.85	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.85
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	6	4	12	4.27	532/1421	4.27	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.27
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	1	5	9	3	3.38	1208/1365	3.38	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.38
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	19	4.67	290/1485	4.67	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.67
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	778/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.83
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	12	4	3.91	989/1483	3.91	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.91
	Lecture														
1	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	348/1425	4.79	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.79
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5 5	19	4.79	755/1426	4.79	4.11	4.41	4.56	4.79
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5 7	19	4.79	695/1418	4.79	3.68	4.09	4.20	4.79
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	16	4.42	623/1416	4.42	3.56	4.25	4.20	4.42
	_	0	1	1	0	2	4	16	4.48	300/1199		3.50	3.97		4.48
э.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	Τ.	1	U	4	4	10	4.40	300/1199	4.40	3.54	3.97	3.04	4.40
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	4	3	7	3.56	993/1312	3.56	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.56
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	3	4	4	7	3.83	1020/1303	3.83	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.83
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	2	5	3	7	3.88	1004/1299	3.88	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.88
	Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	524/ 758	3.69	3.71	4.01	3.80	3.69
	_														
_	Laboratory		_	_			_								
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.07	***
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 70	***	****	4.35	4.43	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 67	***	****	4.34	3.88	****
4.	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
	Field Work														
1	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.43	4.11	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 47	***	****	4.29	4.00	***
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	***	****	4.44	5.00	***
٥.	Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	22		U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 39			4.44	5.00	
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	***	****	4.51	5.00	****

Title THE CHEMICAL WORLD

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA Enrollment: 63

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 191 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Title CARPENTER, TARA

Instructor: Enrollment: 62

Questionnaires: 36

Spring 2005

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 192 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	9	9	14	3 94	1153/1504	3.71	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	16	12	4.11		3.78	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	5	12	14	3.97	,	3.63	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	0	1	2	5	5	4.08		3.52	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	5	4	9	13	3.97		3.93	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	2	1	2	1	4		1201/1365	3.46	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	5	13	12		1076/1485	3.98	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89		4.87	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	9	15	4		1072/1483	3.59	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	7	22	4.47	818/1425	4.26	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	9	23		1036/1426	4.48	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	8	14	10		1064/1418	3.68	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	10	10	13		1004/1416	3.65	3.56	4.26	4.21	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	5	8	18		503/1199		3.52	3.97	3.82	4.24
5. Dia additibudi tetimiques emidice four anderstanding	_	_	-	_	3	Ü	10		303, 1133	3.73	3.32	3.5,	3.02	1.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	6	7	12	3.83	864/1312	3.70	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	3	6	8	9	3.68	1072/1303	3.39	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	3	5	8	8	3.46	1119/1299	3.50	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	5	1	5	2	3	2.81	718/ 758	2.97	3.71	4.01	3.80	2.81
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00		****	4.05	4.09	4.07	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.24	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00		****	3.95	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 207	***	3.84	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 73	***	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	1	1	3 33	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.43	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	, 50	****	****	4.23	4.11	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.65	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
3. Did conferences help you carry out fretu accivities	33	۷	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 39			7.77	5.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	***

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	***

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor:

CARPENTER, TARA

Enrollment: 62 Questionnaires: 36 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 192 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Δ	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	13	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	34
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

CARPENTER, TARA Instructor:

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 193 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	12	20	10	3.80	1244/1504	3.71	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	12	19	10	3.80	1187/1503	3.78	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	8	10	14	12	3.62	1123/1290	3.63	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	4	6	11	3	3.54	1270/1453	3.52	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	6	15	19	4.16	623/1421	3.93	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	24	1	4	6	4	6		1167/1365		3.75	4.08	3.96	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	9	16	17	4.02	979/1485	3.98	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	0	0	2	39	4.95			4.84	4.69	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	4	14	10	5	3.48	1241/1483	3.59	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.48
Logturo														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	5	15	22	1 22	981/1425	4.26	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	13	26		1096/1426	4.48	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	14	12	11		1201/1418	3.68	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	6	3	4	8	12	10		1219/1416	3.65	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	2	12	11	16	4.00			3.52	3.97	3.82	4.00
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	U	2	12	тт.	10	1.00	030/1199	3.93	3.32	3.91	3.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	2	7	14	14	3.71	922/1312	3.70	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	5	6	9	12	10	3.38	1143/1303	3.39	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	7	3	9	8	14	3.46	1119/1299	3.50	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.46
4. Were special techniques successful	3	28	2	2	4	4	2	3.14	667/ 758	2.97	3.71	4.01	3.80	3.14
Laboratory		_	_											
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	3.95	4.23	4.01	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	***	3.84	4.09	4.01	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work	11	^	0	^	^	^	1	F 00	++++/	***	2 22	4 42	2 (2	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44 ****/	****		4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	44	U	0	U	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	^ ^ ^	^ ^ ^ *	4.44	5.00	^ ^ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
-														

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	***	4.49	4.65	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	***

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor:

CARPENTER, TARA

Enrollment: 68 Questionnaires: 45 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 193 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	С	13	General	0	Under-grad	45	Non-major	44
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103 Title

PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

CARPENTER, TARA

Instructor: Enrollment:

73 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 194 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			<u> </u>					Tnat	ructor	Course	Dont	UMBC	Lorrol	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	eque 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	6	2	9	30	15		1271/1504		3.80	4.27	4.13	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	5	12	24	19		1159/1503		3.60	4.20	4.16	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	9	14	22	14		1140/1290		3.59	4.28	4.19	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	30	3	1	7	12	8		1225/1453		3.76	4.21	4.11	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	6	9	20	22	3.97	792/1421		3.67	4.00	3.91	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		42	2	1	2	9	4		1065/1365		3.75	4.08	3.96	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	4	10	13	31	4.02	984/1485	3.98	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	0	2	56	4.92	591/1504		4.84	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	4	5	10	22	10	3.5/	1211/1483	3.59	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	6	17	36	4.37	930/1425	4.26	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	6	12	44	4.61	1036/1426	4.48	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	3	15	15	25	3.87	1110/1418	3.68	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	5	9	4	8	18	18	3.56	1228/1416	3.65	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	3	4	10	12	28	4.02	632/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	15	14	24	4.00	716/1312	3.70	3.33	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	<i>5</i>	5	14	15	16		1113/1303		3.14	4.24	3.93	3.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	5	21	13	15		1092/1299		3.13	4.25	3.94	3.61
4. Were special techniques successful	7	38	3	3	5	2	5	3.17	664/ 758			4.01		3.17
i. Were special decimiques successful	,	30	3	3	J	_	3	3.17	001, 750	2.57	3.71	1.01	3.00	3.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	7	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 233	***	3.96	4.09	3.90	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	. 55	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.07	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	57	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.24	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 225	****	3.95	4.23	4.01	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
Field Work			_	_		_	_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	61	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	61	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	61	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	***

00-27	18	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	3	В	24						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	9	С	23	General	0	Under-grad	63	Non-major	63
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	13	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	53				
				?	1						

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I CARPENTER, TARA

Instructor: Enrollment: 84

Questionnaires: 81

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 195 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		-						Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Geneva 1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	34	0	2	5	19	15	6	3 38	1395/1504	3.71	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	34	0	1	3	21	15	7		1300/1503		3.60	4.20	4.16	3.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	34	0	3	6	14	19	5		1185/1290		3.59	4.28	4.19	3.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	34	24	3	1	7	9	3		1346/1453		3.76	4.21	4.11	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	35	2	2	5	11	15			1036/1421		3.67	4.00	3.91	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	36	29	1	2	6	6			****/1365		3.75	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	36	0	2	4	10	16			1176/1485		3.60	4.16	4.13	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	35	2	0	1	0	2			691/1504		4.84	4.69		4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	40	2	2	4	16	10			1271/1483		3.64		3.97	
									,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	0	2	11	15	18	4.07	1143/1425	4.26	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	34	0	0	2	5	12	28	4.40	1197/1426	4.48	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	5	7	14	13	7	3.22	1312/1418	3.68	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	3	5	4	12	10	12	3.47	1256/1416	3.65	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	2	4	5	10	12	13	3.57	898/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	4	5	9	11			976/1312			4.00	3.69	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	38	0	6	4	15	10	8		1171/1303		3.14	4.24	3.93	3.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41	0	3	4	14	11	8		1133/1299		3.13	4.25	3.94	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	38	33	3	2	2	3	0	2.50	****/ 758	2.97	3.71	4.01	3.80	***
T all area haves														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	76	4	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76 80	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.07	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	79	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 225		3.95	4.09	4.07	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	т	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ 225		3.95	4.23	4.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	79	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	79	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	79	0	0	2	0	0	0		****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
		ŭ	ŭ	_	ŭ	ŭ	J		, , , , ,				3.03	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	80	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	***
-														
_		- 1												

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Ā	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	3	В	17						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	8	C	20	General	0	Under-grad	81	Non-major	80
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 41 2

I

?

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA

Ouestionnaires: 36

Enrollment: 54

Spring 2005 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 196

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Ouestions 1 2 3 4 5 Mean NR NA Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 12 10 3.69 1293/1504 3.71 3.80 4.27 4.13 3.69 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 4.20 4.16 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 17 3.60 1272/1503 3.78 3.60 3.60 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 3.64 1120/1290 3.63 3.59 4.28 4.19 3.64 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 16 2.95 1416/1453 3.52 3.76 4.21 4.11 2.95 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 5 1 10 3.94 827/1421 3.93 3.67 4.00 3.91 3.94 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 21 3 3.29 1241/1365 3.46 3.75 1 4.08 3.96 3.29 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 9 17 4.21 818/1485 3.98 3.60 4.16 4.13 4.21 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 6 1 27 4.70 960/1504 4.87 4.84 4.69 4.66 4.70 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 6 14 5 3.64 1179/1483 3.59 3.64 4.06 3.97 3.64 Lecture 0 0 2 4 15 14 4.06 1147/1425 4.26 3.94 4.41 4.36 4.06 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 4.22 1280/1426 4.48 4.11 4.69 4.56 4.22 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 16 3.71 1186/1418 3.68 3.68 4.25 4.20 3.71 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 4 12 8 3.65 1205/1416 3.65 3.56 4.26 4.21 3.65 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 14 11 3.94 703/1199 3.95 3.52 3.97 3.82 3.94 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 5 3.36 1062/1312 3.70 3.33 4.00 3.69 3.36 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 5 3.12 1188/1303 3.39 3.14 4.24 3.93 3.12 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 8 3.52 1103/1299 3.50 3.13 4.25 3.94 3.52 4. Were special techniques successful 9 18 1 2.78 721/ 758 2.97 3.71 4.01 3.80 2.78 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 32 1 0 3.67 ****/ 233 **** 3.96 4.09 3.90 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3.75 ****/ 244 *** 4.05 4.09 4.07 *** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 32 2 3.00 ****/ 227 * * * * 4.16 4.40 4.24 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 32 1 0 3.33 ****/ 225 **** 3.95 4.23 4.01 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 32 0 3.50 ****/ 207 **** 3.84 4.09 4.01 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 4 0 0 3.00 ****/ 76 **** **** 4.61 4.64 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3.00 ****/ 70 **** 4.35 4.43 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 3.00 ****/ 67 **** 4.34 3.88 **** *** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 31 0 3.00 ****/ 76 4.44 4.51 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 31 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.17 3.83 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 32 0 1 3.00 ****/ 3.33 4.43 3.63 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 32 0 0 3.00 ****/ 56 * * * * 4.23 4.11 *** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 32 2 3.50 ****/ 44 4.65 4.60 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 32 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 47 **** * * * * 4.29 4.00 **** 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 * * * * 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 32 3 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 2 1 1 1 3.20 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.53 4.52 ****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	***

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005 CARPENTER, TARA

Page 196 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 54 Questionnaires: 36

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	3	 Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	В	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Instructor: BUSH, C. ALLEN

Enrollment: 332
Questionnaires: 76

ltimore CountyJUN 14, 2005Spring 2005Job IRBR3029

Page 197

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	14	22	36	4.18	972/1504	4.22	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	17	28	29	4.09	996/1503	4.05	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	11	20	42	4.36	681/1290	4.06	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	64	0	5	2	1	4		****/1453	3.50	3.76	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	5	4	12	16	30	3.93		4.09	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	62	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	****/1365	5.00	3.75	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	17	25	29	4.03	979/1485	4.14	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	3	71	4.92	525/1504	4.96	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	18	39	13	3.90	989/1483	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	14	57	4.71	510/1425	4.48	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	12	60	4.78	773/1426	4.89	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	10	27	34	4.21	887/1418	4.23	3.68	4.25	4.20	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	12	27	32	4.15	961/1416	3.95	3.56	4.26		4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	4	11	23	35	4.22	,		3.52	3.97		4.22
o. Dia addiovidudi occimitation cimanoc your anacistanding	_	_	Ü	-			00		32,,1133		3.32	3.7	3.02	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	63	0	3	2	5	2	1	2.69	****/1312	****	3.33	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	63	0	3	1	5	3	1	2.85	****/1303	****	3.14	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	63	0	1	0	8	2	2	3.31	****/1299	****	3.13	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	63	9	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory		0	_	_	0	-	0	4 00	**** (022		2 06	4 00	2 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	75	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 233	***	3.96	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	75 75	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	75	0	-	0	0	0	1		****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	75	0	0	0	0	•	1		****/ 225		3.95	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	75	U	U	0	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	***	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	***	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	***	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	75	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	75	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	75	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
3. Dia conferences help you carry out freta activities	, ,	U	J	U	U	U		5.00	, 39			1.11	5.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	***	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	***	4.49	4.65	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	***	4.60	4.48	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	***

Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II

Instructor:

BUSH, C. ALLEN Enrollment: 332

Questionnaires: 76

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 197 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	0	 А	23	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	30	1.00-1.99	0	В	30						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	С	14	General	0	Under-grad	76	Non-major	75
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	28	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	68				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0201 University of Maryland
Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II Baltimore County
Instructor: BUSH, C. ALLEN Spring 2005

University of Maryland Page 198
Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005
Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	93	
Questionnaires:	4	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	889/1504	4.22	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1052/1503	4.05	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1078/1290	4.06	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1282/1453	3.50	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	548/1421	4.09	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	3.75	4.08	3.96	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	761/1485	4.14	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	4.96	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1233/1483	3.70	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1036/1425	4.48	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	4.89	4.11	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1418	4.23	3.68	4.25	4.20	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1167/1416	3.95	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	636/1199	4.11	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.00

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

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 199 Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029 Spring 2005

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	7	6	1	3.05	1447/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	5	5	4	3.26	1379/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	6	5	3	3.11	1233/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	10	3	3.83	1148/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	827/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	558/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	8	3	4	3.26	1346/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	394/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	4	3	2	5	0	2.57	1441/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	5	2	5	5	3 44	1320/1425	3.43	3 94	4.41	4.36	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	4	5	3	4		1404/1426		4.11	4.69	4.56	3.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5 6	1	2	5 6	4		1327/1418	3.15	3.68	4.09	4.20	3.70
	1	0	6	2	5	1	_						4.20	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		8	2	2	5 4	2			1356/1416		3.56	4.26		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	2	2	4	2	1	2.82	1108/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	1	3	1	1	2.56	1240/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	0	2	1	2		1235/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	1	2	2	0		1265/1299		3.13	4.25		2.22
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	2	0	0		****/ 758				3.80	****
1. Mere precial decimination bacoestrai		•	_	ŭ	_	Ü	Ü	_,,,,	, , , , ,	1.00	3.72	1.01	3.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	2	2	9	4	3.72	179/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.72
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	119/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	113/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	103/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23		4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	90/ 207		3.84	4.09	4.01	
J. Were requirements for tab reports electry specified	_	O	O	2	2	-	10	1,22	J0/ Z0/	3.73	3.01	1.05	1.01	1.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	***	***	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
1. 10 what degree courd you discuss your evaluations	т/	т	U	U	U	т	U	4. 00	/ 4/			7.47	4. 00	
Self Paced		_												
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	***	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 18 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 20 *** 4.24 4.92 ****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 18 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.51 5.00 ****

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 199 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 19

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
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	n
				P	1			responses to	be sid	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_		_	
				?	2						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

MASUCCI, MICHAE (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 19

Title

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 200 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

				equer		5	_		tructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions	NR	NA 	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	7	6	1	3.05	1447/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	5	5	4	3.26	1379/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	6	5	3	3.11	1233/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	10	3	3.83	1148/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	827/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	558/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	8	3	4	3.26	1346/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.95	394/1504		4.84	4.69	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	741/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	5	0	9	4.13	1111/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	4	8		1232/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	754/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	4	3		4.15	953/1416		3.56	4.26	4.21	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	860/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	1	3	1	1	2.56	1240/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	4	0	2	1	2		1235/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	1	2	2	0		1265/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	2.22
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	2	2	9	4	3.72	179/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.72
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	119/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	113/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	103/ 225		3.95	4.23		4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	90/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	***	****	4.61	4.64	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	***	****	4.34	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	***	****	4.17	3.83	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 18 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 20 *** 4.24 4.92 ****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 18 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 16 **** 4.51 5.00 ****

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: MASUCCI, MICHAE (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 200 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 19

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
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	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Page 201 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 24

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	3	5	4	4	2 95	1461/1504	3 36	3.80	4.27	4.13	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	8	4	4		1400/1503		3.60	4.20	4.16	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	5	2	4	4		1260/1290		3.59	4.28	4.19	2.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	5	3	5	4		1394/1453		3.76	4.21	4.11	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	5	1	4	6	3		1297/1421		3.67	4.00	3.91	3.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	6	3	5		1262/1365		3.75	4.08	3.96	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	6	1	5	2		1455/1485		3.60	4.16	4.13	2.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	19	4.76			4.84	4.69	4.66	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	6	2	7	2	1		1450/1483		3.64	4.06	3.97	2.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	3	5	a	3 76	1255/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	5	1	4	5	6		1398/1426		4.11	4.69	4.56	3.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	3	7	3	3		1361/1418		3.68	4.09	4.20	2.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	2	5	3	3		1371/1416		3.56	4.26	4.21	2.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	2	1	2	0			1138/1199		3.52	3.97	3.82	
J. Did addiovisual eccliniques chilanee your understanding	O	13	2	_	2	U	_	2.50	1130/1133	3.00	3.32	3.77	3.02	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	6	0	2	4	2	2.71	1217/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	7	2	2	2	1	2.14	1269/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	5	2	0	1	1.93	1276/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.93
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	5	1	3	2	6	3.18	212/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	2	1	4	4	6	3.65	192/ 244		4.05	4.09	4.07	3.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	2	1	3	2	9	3.88			4.16	4.40	4.24	3.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	3	4	3	2	5	3.12	210/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.12
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	4	3	5	3	2	2.76	200/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	2.76
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	1	1		,	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	***

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67 ****/	36	***	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Spring 2005 Page 201 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Δ	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General		Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Instructor: SARAH, EVANS (Instr. B) Spring 2005

Page 202 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 21

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	3	5	4	4	2 95	1461/1504	3 36	3.80	4.27	4.13	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	8	4	4		1400/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	5	2	4	4		1260/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	5	3	5	4		1394/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	5	1	4	6	3		1297/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	6	3	5		1262/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	6	1	5	2		1455/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	19	4.76		4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	1	4	6	4		1324/1483			4.06	3.97	
Lecture				_	_	-	_	2 04	1050/1405	2 42	2 24			2 50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	3	6	1	5		1350/1425		3.94	4.41	4.36	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	4	2	4	5	5		1400/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	1	6	4	4		1319/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	3	4	1	4		1345/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	6	0	2	4	2	2.71	1217/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	7	2	2	2	1	2.14	1269/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	5	2	0	1	1.93	1276/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.93
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	5	1	3	2	6	3.18	212/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	2	1	4	4	6	3.65	192/ 244		4.05	4.09	4.07	3.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	2	1	3	2	9	3.88	190/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	3	4	3	2	5	3.12	210/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.12
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	4	3	5	3	2	2.76	200/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09		2.76
Seminar	1.0	-	-	0	0	0	-	2 00	****		ale ale ale ale	4 61	1 6 1	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	0.00		****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 73	****	***	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	,	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
									-					

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67 ****/	36	***	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: SARAH, EVANS (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 202 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General		Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Title

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 203 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('011200	L'tra luation	Ouestionnaire
bradent	COULSE	ii vai ua cii oii	Oneprinitatie

			Fr	eaue	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	-		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	10	2	3		1461/1504		3.80	4.27	4.13	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	9	4	2	2		1486/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	8	4	5	2	1		1284/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	9	6			1399/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	3	5	8	2		1113/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	8	4			1191/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	6	4	3		1415/1485		3.60	4.16	4.13	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1 10	0	0 1	20		743/1504		4.84	4.69	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	U	3	Τ0	6	1	U	2.25	1458/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	6	6	5	1	2.85	1392/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	6	4	7	2	1		1420/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	8	5	1	5	1		1401/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	5	6	1	2		1388/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	2	3	0	0	1		1175/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	2	2	0	0	1.86	1296/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1257/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	1	1	0	0	1.50	1289/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.50
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	***
- 1														
Laboratory	0	0	-1	0	_	_	_	2 65	102/022	2 64	2 06	4 00	2 00	2 60
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	2 4	6	6	6	3.67	183/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0 1	1	4 5	5 3	8 9	3	3.38	208/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	-	1	3 6	9 5	_	3.50	204/ 227		4.16	4.40	4.24 4.01	3.50 3.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	2	4	2	5 7	6	3.50	189/ 225 165/ 207		3.95 3.84	4.23	4.01	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	U	U	۷	4	2	/	О	3.52	105/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.54
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	***
Field Work		_	_	_		_	_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	***	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	***
Service of the servic		Ü	ū	_	-	-	ŭ		, 33					

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	20	***	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Questionnaires: 21

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 25 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 203 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General		Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				;	2						

University of Maryland
LAB I Baltimore County

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Balt
SARAH, EVANS (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 25 Ouestionnaires: 21

Title

Instructor:

Spring 2005

Page 204
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	21	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	
				Freq	uencies	

			Fre	eane	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	-		Mean	Mean
~ ************************************														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	10	2	3	2.95	1461/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	2.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	9	4	2	2	2.48	1486/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	8	4	5	2	1	2.20	1284/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	9	6	0	3.05	1399/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	3	5	8	2	3.50	1113/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	8	4	4	3.42	1191/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	6	4	3	2.86	1415/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	20	4.86	743/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	2	10	2	3.75	1123/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	3	0	3	4	3	3.31	1337/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	1	6	3	3	3.43	1388/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	1159/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	3	4	2	3.08	1319/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	2	2	0	0	1.86	1296/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1257/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	1	1	0	0	1.50	1289/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.50
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	2	6	6	6	3.67	183/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	4	5	8	3	3.38	208/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	5	3	9	3	3.50	204/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	2	1	6	5	6	3.60	189/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	2	4	2	7	6	3.52	165/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.52
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	***	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
·														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	***

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Questionnaires: 21

Title

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor:

SARAH, EVANS (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 25

Page 204 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Questionnaires: 14

Title

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 205 Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	4	4	1	2.86	1473/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	2.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	3	1		1467/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	4	1	0	1		1287/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1083/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	3	2	4	3.31	1222/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	1	6	2	3.31	1236/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	5	2	2	3.00	1387/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	6	3	0	2.83	1411/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.92
Lecture		_		_	_	_	_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	3	6			1324/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	1	5	2			1403/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	5	5	1		1325/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	1	4	1	2		1375/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	0	0	0	Ο	1 00	1310/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	0	0	0	0		****/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	1	0	0	0		****/1299		3.13	4.25	3.94	****
5. Did the imperator encodings fair and open discussion		Ü	_	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	1.33	, 1200	1.00	3.13	1.25	3.71	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	201/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	170/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	197/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	2	1	1	6	4	3.64	187/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	106/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

ZHANG, HAILANG (Instr. B)

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 206 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 14

Instructor:

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3	E	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Questions		NA				- 4		Mean	Ralik	 	Mean	Mean	Mean 	меап
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	2	4	4	1	2.86	1473/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	2.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	3	1	2.71	1467/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	3	4	1	0	1	2.11	1287/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1083/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	3	2	4	3.31	1222/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	1	6	2	3.31	1236/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	5	2	2	3.00	1387/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	6	2	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.92
Lecture	_		_	_	_	_	_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	2	3	0			1340/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	5	1	3		1364/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	0	3	2	1		1364/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	4	0	1		1324/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	0	0	Ο	Λ	1 00	1310/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	3	0	0	0	0		****/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	1	0	0	0		****/1299		3.13	4.25	3.94	****
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion	11	U	4	_	U	U	U	1.33	/1299	1.09	3.13	1.23	3.94	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	201/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	170/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	197/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	2	1	1	6	4	3.64	187/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	106/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				2	1						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Spring 2005 Page 207
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 14

Instructor:

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5		tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General	0	0	2	2	2	4	4	2 42	1384/1504	2 26	2 00	4 07	4 12	2 42
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	∠ 5	2 0	2 4	4 1	4		1434/1504	3.36 2.89	3.80	4.27 4.20	4.13 4.16	3.43 2.93
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	1	2	3	2	3	3		1226/1290	2.89	3.59	4.20	4.16	2.93 3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3 1	5	<i>5</i>	2		1209/1453	3.46	3.59	4.20	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	4	3		1036/1421	3.40	3.70	4.00	3.91	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	2	4		903/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	1	5	2		1298/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504			4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	5	0	4	2	0		1457/1483				3.97	
Lecture			_		_		_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	1	5	1	3		1392/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	4	1	3	3	3		1406/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	2	4	2	2		1371/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	3 1	3	0	2		1398/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	Τ	3	0	0	2.40	1153/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1233/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1275/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1272/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	***
Laboratory	-	0	-	-1	0		_	2 05	165/022	2 64	2 06	4 00	2 00	2 05
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	Ţ	2	4	5	3.85	167/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	141/ 244		4.05	4.09	4.07	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15		3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.15
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	4	0	2	2	4	3.17	,	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	2	3	/	4.15	97/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.15
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	***
_			1		_									

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

I 0 Other 12 ? 1

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor:

(Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 208 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 14

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies	5	_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA 	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	2	4	4	3.43	1384/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	0	4	1	4	2.93	1434/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	2	3	3	3.15	1226/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1209/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1036/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	903/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	1298/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	2	Λ	2 60	1233/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	0	1	1	0		1275/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	0	1	1	0		1272/1299	1.89	3.14	4.25	3.94	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	3 1	1	0	U	0		****/ 758	1.80	3.13	4.25	3.80	****
1. Were special techniques successivi	9	3	_		U	U	U	1.50	/ /30	1.00	3.71	4.01	3.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	167/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	141/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.15
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	174/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.15
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	4	0	2	2	4	3.17	205/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	97/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.15
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
		-	-	-	-	_	-		, , , ,					

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

21

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor:

BROTHERS, BROTE (Instr. A)

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 209 Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	1	7	2	4	3.06	1447/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	4	4	2	2.72	1465/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	7	3	3	2	2.67	1271/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	3	7	2	3.06	1399/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	3	3	3	2.94	1327/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	6	4	2	2.89	1318/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	5	2	3	2	2.44	1459/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	866/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	6	4	4	0	0	1.86	1477/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	4	1	4	4	2.89	1388/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	4	7	5	2			1423/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	7	3	4	4	0		1402/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	3	3	2	0		1406/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	2	0	Ο	1	1 75	1300/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	6	2	0	0			1295/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	2	2	0			1279/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.75
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	4	3	1	4		3.18	212/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	4	2	6	3	3.38	209/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	2	6	1	4	3	3.00	219/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	4	2	2	3	5	3.19	203/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.19
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	160/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.63

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				2	0						

Title

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

RS, PAUL (Instr. B)

Instructor: Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 18 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 210 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	00,,,,,,,	Errolustion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnaire

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	0	4	1	7	2	4	2 06	1447/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	1 12	3.06
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	•	-	-		1	∠	4		,					
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	4	4	2		1465/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3 4	7	3	3	2		1271/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	3	/	2		1399/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	3	3	3		1327/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	6	4	2		1318/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	5	2	3	2		1459/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14		866/1504	4.85	4.84		4.66	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1415/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	1	Ο	1	4 00	****/1425	3 43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	1	٥	0		****/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1418		3.68	4.25	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1416		3.56	4.26	4.21	
1. Did the rectares contribute to what you rearned	Τ,	O	O	O	_	O	O	3.00	71110	3.02	3.30	1.20	1.21	2.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	2	0	0	1	1.75	1300/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	6	2	0	0	0	1.25	1295/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	2	2	0	0	1.75	1279/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.75
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
* - h														
Laboratory	1	0	4	2	-1		_	2 10	010/022	2 64	2 06	4 00	2 00	2 10
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	Τ	0	4	3	Τ	4	5	3.18	212/ 233	3.64		4.09	3.90	3.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	4	2	6	3	3.38	209/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	2	6	1	4	3	3.00	219/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	4	2	2	3	5	3.19	203/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.19
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	160/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.63

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				2	0						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title KEATHING, LORYN (Instr. C) Instructor:

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 211 Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies		1		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	1	7	2	4	3 06	1447/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	4	4	2		1465/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	7	3	3	2		1271/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	3	7	2		1399/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	3	3	3		1327/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	6	4	2		1318/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	2.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	5	2	3	2		1459/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14		866/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	4	5	2		1204/1483	3.12	3.64		3.97	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	3	1	0	2	3	3.11	1363/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1395/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	4	0	3	2	0	2.33	1400/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	3	0	4	0	2.67	1362/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	7	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	2	0	0			1300/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	6	2	0	0			1295/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	4	2	2	0	0		1279/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.75
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory		_	_	_	_		_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	4	3	1	4	5	3.18	212/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	4	2	6	3	3.38	209/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	2	6	1	4	3	3.00	219/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	4	2	2	3	5	3.19	203/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.19
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	Τ	3	5	5	3.63	160/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.63

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_		-	
				?	0						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 22

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 212 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
a 1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	8	7	3 83	1239/1504	3 36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	7	4	5	3		1438/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	9	2	2	2		1281/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	8	2	7		1253/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	6	3	3	6		1276/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	4	5			1118/1365		3.75	4.08	3.96	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	9	5	2	3.05	1383/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	8	4	4	3	1	2.25	1458/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	5	5	7	2		1364/1425		3.94	4.41	4.36	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	4	3	12	1	1		1418/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	7	5	4	1		1380/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	8	3	5	2	2		1391/1416		3.56	4.26	4.21	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	1	6	0	2	3.33	987/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	2	4	1	0	1.93	1293/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	7	6	1	0	1	1.80	1289/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	9	0	0	0	1.60	1285/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	3	2	3	3	5	3.31	207/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	193/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	140/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	178/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	3	2	2	8	3.81	142/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.81
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 76	***	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	***	****	4.35	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	***	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	***	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****

Questionnaires: 22

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A) Enrollment: 23

University of Maryland Page 212 Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

CHAUDHAIR, PRAJ (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 22

Title

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 213 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('011200	L'tra luation	Ouestionnaire
bradent	COULSE	ii vai ua cii oii	Oneprinitatie

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	0	0	0	_	0	-	2 00	1020/1504	2 26	2 00	4 05	4 10	2 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0 7	5	8	./		1239/1504		3.80	4.27	4.13	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	•	4	5	3		1438/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1 2	5 1	9 2	2	2	2		1281/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2 1	3	2 6	8 3	2	7		1253/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	3 4	5	6 6		1276/1421 1118/1365	3.37 3.52	3.67 3.75	4.00 4.08	3.91 3.96	3.14 3.58
<u> </u>	0	0	2	4	9	5 5	2		1383/1485	2.93	3.60	4.08	4.13	3.58
 Was the grading system clearly explained How many times was class cancelled 	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1504		4.84	4.16	4.13	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	9		4.42	433/1483		3.64	4.09	3.97	3.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	U	U	1	9	9	4.42	433/1403	3.14	3.04	4.00	3.97	3.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	8	7		1008/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	6	7	4	3.78	1364/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	5	5	6		1106/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	2	5	7		1135/1416		3.56	4.26	4.21	3.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	748/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	2	4	1	0	1.93	1293/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	1.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	7	6	1	0	1		1289/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	6	9	0	0	_		1285/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25		1.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	2	0	0	1	1		****/ 758				3.80	****
Laboratory	_	0	2	_	2	2	_	2 21	005/000	2 64	2 06	4 00	2 00	2 21
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	3	2 2	3	3	5	3.31	207/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6 6	0	1	0	4 2	4 5	5 9	3.63	193/ 244		4.05	4.09	4.07	3.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	2	1	2		9 7	4.44	140/ 227		4.16	4.40	4.24	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	3	2	4 2	-	3.81	178/ 225		3.95	4.23		3.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	Ь	U	Τ	3	2	2	8	3.81	142/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.81
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	***	****	4.35	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	***	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 56	***	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	***	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
		_	-	-	-	-	_		, 20					

Questionnaires: 22

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor:

Title CHAUDHAIR, PRAJ (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23

Spring 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Page 213

JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 214

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Spring 2005 Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A) Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	Λ	1	2	1	2 E/	1343/1504	2 26	2 00	4.27	4.13	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	2	<u>+</u>		1482/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	<i>5</i>	4	2	1	0		1290/1290	2.09	3.59	4.28	4.19	1.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	T	2		1385/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	6	4	Δ		1293/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	6	1		1133/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	5	0	1		1445/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	4	6	0	1		1434/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06		3.03
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		U	_	7	U	U		2.07	1434/1403	3.14	3.01	4.00	3.91	3.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	5	3	1	1	2.50	1409/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	3	4	3	0		1419/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	6	4	1	1	2.62	1386/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	3	2	0	2.23	1397/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	3	1	0	2.33	1272/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	3	4	0	0	2.22	1263/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	2	4	0	0	2.11	1271/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	2.11
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	167/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	171/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.85
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	174/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.15
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	182/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	170/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.46

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

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 215 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General						. – – – .								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	3	4	3.54	1343/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	3	0		1482/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	5	4	2	1	0		1290/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	1.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	3	2		1385/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	6	4	0	3.08	1293/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	6	1	3.55	1133/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	6	0	1	2.62	1445/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	5	0	3.40	1276/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1299/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.03
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	5	3		1280/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	2	2	2		1250/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	3	3	0		1352/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	0	0	1	0	0		****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	1	0	2 22	1272/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	3	3 4	0	0		1263/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	2	4	0	0		1271/1299	1.89	3.14	4.25	3.94	2.22
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	2	0	0	0		****/ 758	1.80	3.13	4.23	3.80	****
4. Were special techniques successiul	4	,	U	2	U	U	U	2.00	/ /56	1.00	3.71	4.01	3.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	167/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	171/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.85
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	174/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.15
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	2	1	0	4	5	3.75	182/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	3	2	3	4	3.46	170/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.46
The state of the s	-	-	_	-	_	-	_	20	,					

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

Questionnaires: 18

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title

Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A) Enrollment: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

Page 216 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	6	6	2	3.28	1414/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	5	3	1	2.61	1477/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	5	3	4	1	2.50	1276/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	8	4	1	3.00	1404/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	2	4	6	1	3.00	1305/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	7	1	4	3.13	1280/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	11	2	2	1	2.39	1466/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	866/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	7	5	3	1	0	1.88	1476/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	4	5	4	2	2.89	1388/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	6	9	1	2	0	1.94	1426/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	6	8	2	2	0	2.00	1410/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	2	4	3	1	2.28	1395/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	3	0	2	1	0	2.17	1175/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	2	2	2	0	2.20	1280/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	5	3	1	1	0	1.80	1289/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	7	1	1	1	0	1.60	1285/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.60
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	755/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	1.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	4	3	3	3	3.21	209/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.21
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	2	4	6	1	3.13	222/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	2	1	5	5	3.79	194/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.79
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	6	4	3	3.40	196/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	2	4	3	4	3.33	182/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.33

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	.3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_		_	
				?	0						

Questionnaires: 18

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title

ZHANG, HAILANG (Instr. B)

Instructor: Enrollment: 20 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 217

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	6	6	2	3.28	1414/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	5	3	1		1477/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	5	3	4	1		1276/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	8	4	1		1404/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	2	4	6	1		1305/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	7	1	4		1280/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	11	2	2	1		1466/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	866/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69		4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	731/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06		3.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1076/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1369/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1141/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1199/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	884/1199		3.52	3.97	3.82	2.88
10.00 1 10.00 1 10.00 1 10.00 1 10.00														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	2	2	2	0	2.20	1280/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	5	3	1	1	0	1.80	1289/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	7	1	1	1	0	1.60	1285/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.60
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	755/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	1.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	1	4	3	3	3	3.21	209/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.21
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	2	4	6	1	3.13	222/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	2	1	5	5	3.79	194/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.79
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	6	4	3	3.40	196/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	2	4	3	4	3.33	182/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.33

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	 13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				2	0						

Questionnaires: 21

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Page 218
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	equei	ncie	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General			_	_	_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	9	5	4		1384/1504		3.80	4.27	4.13	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	8	3	2		1445/1503		3.60	4.20	4.16	2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	5	5	4	2		1261/1290		3.59	4.28	4.19	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	3	4	7		1001/1453		3.76	4.21	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	3	1	5	6		1150/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	8	4		1065/1365		3.75	4.08	3.96	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	3	6	5	3.38	1317/1485		3.60	4.16	4.13	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16		830/1504		4.84	4.69	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	8	4	6	0	0	1.89	1476/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	6	8	2	3	2 90	1386/1425	3.43	3 94	4.41	4.36	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	7	6	6	1	1		1425/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	7	5	4	3	1			3.15	3.68	4.09	4.20	3.10
	1	0	11	3	2	2	2		1401/1418					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		10	11 5	2	2				1400/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	5	2	2	0	Т	2.00	1181/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	3	3	2	1	2.36	1269/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	8	1	2	0	2		1275/1303		3.14	4.24	3.93	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	10	0	2	0	1		1284/1299		3.13	4.25	3.94	1.62
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	1	1	1	0	1		****/ 758			4.01	3.80	****
1. Here special ceciminques successful	,		_	_	_	Ü	_	2.75	, , , 50	1.00	3.71	1.01	3.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	2	3	7	5	3.72	179/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.72
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	6	9	1	3.50	196/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	5	2	7	4	3.56	201/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	3	1	0	4	10	3.94	162/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	2	2	9	3	3.50	166/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.50
Seminar	1.0	-	0	0	0	0	0	4 00	****	****		4 61	4 6 4	4.4.4.4.
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	,		****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 70	****		4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 73	***	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	•	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
J. Dia conferences help you early out litera activities	1)		U	0	0		U	1.00	, 39			1.11	5.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 218 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Instructor: PAN, ON MEI (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 21

Title

Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Page 219

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	9	5	4	3.43	1384/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	8	3	2		1445/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	5	5	4	2		1261/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	3	4	7		1001/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	3	1	5	6		1150/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	8	4		1065/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	3	6	5		1317/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	830/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	3	1	3	0	0		1468/1483		3.64	4.06	3.97	2.73
Lecture									,					
	16	0	1	2	1	0	1	2 60	****/1425	2 12	2 04	1 11	1 26	3.63
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1		2		_			3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15 15	0	2	0 1	2 1	1 1	1 1		1414/1426 1379/1418	3.30 3.15	4.11	4.69	4.56 4.20	3.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		1	2	1	0	1	0				3.68	4.25		3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16 16	2	0	3	0	U T	0		****/1416 ****/1199	3.02 3.06	3.56	4.26 3.97	4.21 3.82	2.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Τ0	۷	U	3	U	U	U	2.00	***/1199	3.06	3.54	3.97	3.82	2.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	3	3	2	1	2.36	1269/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	8	1	2	0	2		1275/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	10	0	2	0	1		1284/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.62
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	1	1	1	0	1		****/ 758	1.80		4.01	3.80	****
-														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	2	3	7	5	3.72	179/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.72
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	6	9	1	3.50	196/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	5	2	7	4	3.56	201/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	3	1	0	4	10	3.94	162/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	2	2	9	3	3.50	166/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 56	***	****	4.43	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.05	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	***	4.44	5.00	***
3. Did conferences help you carry out freta activities	12	_	U	U	U	_	U	- 1. 00	/ 39			7.77	3.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	***	****	4.53	4.52	***

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor:

PAN, ON MEI (Instr. B) University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 219 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 21

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Page 220 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. C)
Enrollment: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eaue	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
General	_	_	_	_		_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	9	5	4		1384/1504		3.80	4.27	4.13	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	8	3	2		1445/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	5	5	4	2		1261/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	3	4	7		1001/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	3	1	5	6		1150/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	8	4		1065/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	3	6	5		1317/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	830/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	580/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	940/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1312/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.03
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	772/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	3	5		1099/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	0	1	2	0			780/1199		3.52	3.97	3.82	2.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	3	3	2	1		1269/1312			4.00	3.69	2.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	8	1	2	0	2		1275/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	10	0	2	0	1		1284/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.62
4. Were special techniques successful	7	10	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	2	3	7	5	3.72	179/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.72
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	6	9	1	3.50	196/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	5	2	7	4	3.56	201/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	3	1	0	4	10	3.94	162/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	2	2	9	3	3.50			3.84	4.09	4.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 70	***	****	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	***	****	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	***	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	***
Self Paced		_	_	_	_	_	_	4 5 5				4	4	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

24

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 21

(Instr. C)

Page 220 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors 	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				;	0						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 23

Title

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 221 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Ctudant	('011200	L'tra luation	Ouestionnaire
bradent	COULSE	ii vai ua cii oii	Oneprinitatie

	-			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	-		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	3	9	6		1322/1504		3.80	4.27	4.13	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	9	4	3		1428/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	3	8	2	4		1257/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	7	8			1255/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	9	3	6		1131/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	4	5	9		960/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	5	4	7		1314/1485		3.60	4.16	4.13	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0 5	0	0 6	0 3	0	3 3	20		726/1504		4.84	4.69	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	ь	3	6	3	U	2.33	1454/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	5	5	4	6	3.32	1336/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	5	4	3	7	3	2.95	1410/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	2	6	3	5	2.95	1342/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	5	3	3	4	2.64	1365/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	17	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	9	2	1	1	2		1288/1312		3.33	4.00	3.69	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	6	2	1	0		1286/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	8	2	2	0			1289/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	2	2	3	5	11	3.91	160/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	2	3	3	5	10	3.78	180/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	2	4	4	6	7	3.52	203/ 227		4.16	4.40	4.24	3.52
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	1	3	2	7	9	3.91	169/ 225		3.95	4.23		3.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	1	5	7	9	3.96			3.84	4.09		3.96
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.88	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	0	1	0	2 00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	***
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	-			•			-					_		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	***

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50 ****/	20	***	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor: BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 23 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 221

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	18	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

(Instr. C) Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 23

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 222 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Frequencies		Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect			
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	3	9	6	3.61	1322/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.61
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	3	9	4	3	2.96	1428/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.96
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	3	8	2	4	2.78	1257/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	2.78
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	7	8	4	3.59	1255/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.59
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	9	3	6	3.48	1131/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.48
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	4	5	9	3.82	960/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.82
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	5	4	7	3.39	1314/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.39
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	726/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.87
	•														
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.87
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.58
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.55
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.23
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	9	2	1	1	2	2.00	1288/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.00
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	6	6	2	1	0	1.87	1286/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.87
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	8	2	2	0	0	1.50	1289/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.50
4.	Were special techniques successful	11	8	2	2	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	2	2	3	5	11	3.91	160/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.91
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	2	3	3	5	10	3.78	180/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.78
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	2	4	4	6	7	3.52	203/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	3.52
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	1	3	2	7	9	3.91	169/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.91
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	1	5	7	9	3.96	119/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.96
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67		****	4.34	3.88	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	20	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
	Field Work														
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 58		3.33	4.43	3.63	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	5.00	****
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 40		****	4.53	4.52	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35		****	4.49	4.65	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 36		****	4.60	4.48	****
4.	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 20 1 0 1 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ 16 **** **** 4.51 5.00 ****

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor:

Title

(Instr. C)

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 222

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	18	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 13

Instructor:

Title

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 223
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Student Co	urse Evaluation Questionnaire
------------	-------------------------------

Questions			Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	NR 													
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	5	4	2	3.31	1409/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	4	2	3.08	1410/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	3	2		1236/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	2	4	3		1370/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	0	3	1		1364/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	2.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	4	4		1172/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	2	3	3		1352/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0 1	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	Т	3	4	1	0	2.56	1443/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	4	2	3	3.08	1364/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	5	3	2	1	2	2.38	1420/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	6	1	2	2.92	1349/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	1	2	3	2.69	1359/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	0	2	1	1		1265/1312		3.33	4.00	3.69	2.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	4	1	2	0	1		1271/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	2	3	0	1		1248/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	139/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	145/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	147/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	153/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	106/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.00
Field Work	1.0		•	-	•	•	_	0 00		4.4.4.4		4 65	4 60	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	***	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.44	5.00	***
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	***	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
-														

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gr	rades Rea	asons	Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required fo	or Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В 5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13

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
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	10	
				?	0			

University of Maryland

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I Baltimore County GANGULY, SOUMYA (Instr. B) Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Page 224

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 13

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncies	;		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	. 1	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0		0	2	0	5	4	2	3 31	1409/1504	3.36	3 80	4.27	4.13	3.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0		0	3	1	3	4	2		1410/1503			4.20	4.16	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0		0	2	3	3	3			1236/1290		3.59			3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0		0	3	1	2	4			1370/1453			4.21	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned			4	2	3	0	3			1364/1421		3.67		3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you lear			0	3	0	2	4			1172/1365			4.08	3.96	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0		0	1	4	2	3			1352/1485		3.60		4.13	3.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0		0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00			4.84			5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiver			1	0	0	0	5			338/1483					
T a whoma															
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3		0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	900/1425	3 43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2		0	0	0	0	3			878/1426			4.69	4.56	3.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly			0	0	0	3	4			984/1418		3.68			3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	.y 2		0	0	1	3	1			1029/1416		3.56		4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi			6	1	0	2	0			1050/1199					
5. Dia addiovisual ecciniques ciniance your understands	.119 5		O	_	O	2	U	_	3.00	1030/1122	3.00	3.32	3.57	3.02	3.00
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	ed 5		0	4	0	2	1	1	2.38	1265/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participat	e 5		0	4	1	2	0	1	2.13	1271/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi	on 5		0	2	2	3	0	1	2.50	1248/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5		6	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3		0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	139/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background informat			0	0	0	3	4		4.00				4.09	4.07	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activiti			0	0	0	0	6			147/ 227			4.40		4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3		0	1	1	0	3		4.00			3.95	4.23	4.01	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	a 3		0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	106/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.00
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12		0	0	1	0	0	0	2,00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12		0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 47	="	****	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities			0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 39		****	4.44	5.00	****
or had conferenced merr you carry out from acceptance			Ü	_	ŭ	Ü	ŭ	Ü	2.00	, 33				3.00	
Self Paced															
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12		0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 20		****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12		0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	***
E	requenc	у І	Dist	ribu	utior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra	ades				Pos	asons				т,	те			Majors	!

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Gr	rades Rea	asons	Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required fo	or Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В 5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13

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
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	10	
				?	0			

16

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title Instructor:

BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A)

Spring 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 225 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

				-	ncies				ructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	851/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1281/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	853/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1136/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	903/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1032/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1440/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1340/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1398/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	1330/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1290/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1093/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1121/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1106/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	186/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	187/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	164/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	190/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23		3.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	3.29	186/ 207				4.01	
_		<b>5</b> ' .	1											

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	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	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_		_	
				2	1						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

CHANDRASEKHARAH (Instr. B)

Page 226 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 7

Title

Instructor:

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

				-	ncies		_		ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	851/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1281/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	3.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	853/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1136/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	903/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1032/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1440/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1197/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.30
T o otherwise														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4 00	1165/1405	2 12	2 04	4.41	1 26	2 61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2			1165/1425 1128/1426	3.43	4.11	4.41	4.36 4.56	3.64 3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	1		1013/1418	3.15	3.68	4.09	4.20	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2			1013/1416	3.13	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	1	0		****/1199		3.52	3.97	3.82	3.00
3. Did addiovisual teeliniques chilanee your understanding	J	3	U	U	U	_	U	4.00	/ 11//	3.00	3.32	3.71	3.02	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1093/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1121/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1106/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	186/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	3.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	3	3	1		187/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	3.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	5	_	4.29	164/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	190/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	3.29	186/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.29
Frequ	encv	. Digt	-rih	ut i oı	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	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	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_		_	
				2	1						

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Title BROTHERS, PAUL (Instr. A) Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 227 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				-	ncies	3	_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1322/1504	3.36	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	1	1		1453/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1175/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1377/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	548/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1104/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1419/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1314/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1327/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	3 00	1367/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	0	0	1		1424/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	0	1		1367/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	1	1		1199/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	0	0	0		****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion	•	•	•	•	•	•			1000/1010	0 00	2 22	4 00	2 62	0 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	0	0	Τ		1272/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	0	0	0		1297/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0 1	2 1	0	0	0	0		1294/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94 3.80	1.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	Т	Т	U	U	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	1.80	3./1	4.01	3.80	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	71/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.75
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ation	า									

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

INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I

Instructor: CHANDRASEKHARAH (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005 Page 228 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	_	_					_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	2		1322/1504		3.80	4.27	4.13	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	1	1		1453/1503	2.89	3.60	4.20	4.16	2.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	2		1175/1290	2.77	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	0	2		1377/1453	3.46	3.76	4.21	4.11	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	548/1421	3.37	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	2		1104/1365	3.52	3.75	4.08	3.96	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	1	1		1419/1485	2.93	3.60	4.16	4.13	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	4		1314/1504	4.85	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1483	3.12	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1415/1425	3.43	3.94	4.41	4.36	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	0	2		1373/1426	3.30	4.11	4.69	4.56	2.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	0	0	1		1379/1418	3.15	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	0		1324/1416	3.02	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/1199	3.06	3.52	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	0	0	1		1272/1312	2.22	3.33	4.00	3.69	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	0	0	0		1297/1303	2.02	3.14	4.24	3.93	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1294/1299	1.89	3.13	4.25	3.94	1.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	1.80	3.71	4.01	3.80	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	71/ 233	3.64	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.50
. Did the lab increase understanding of the material . Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 244	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.07	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1 1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 227	3.95	4.16	4.40	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 225	3.74	3.95	4.23	4.01	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.75
1 114 101 102 103 10F0103 0100111 0P0011100	_	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	_	•	1	20, 20,	3.73	3.01	1.00	1.01	2

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

Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM

Instructor: DA SILVA, VERA

Enrollment: 68
Questionnaires: 46

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 229 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	10	4	13	11	8	3.07	1445/1504	3.07	3.80	4.27	4.13	3.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	7	11	15	9	4		1450/1503		3.60	4.20	4.16	2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	13	12	9	7	3.00	1236/1290	3.00	3.59	4.28	4.19	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	34	3	3	2	1	3	2.83	1432/1453	2.83	3.76	4.21	4.11	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	4	3	10	7	17	3.73	976/1421	3.73	3.67	4.00	3.91	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	38	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	****/1365	****	3.75	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	6	14	9	12	3.42	1306/1485	3.42	3.60	4.16	4.13	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	42	4.93	460/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	9	5	16	7	1	2.63	1436/1483	2.63	3.64	4.06	3.97	2.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	7	4	7	14	10	3.38	1329/1425	3.38	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	2	5	13	21		1284/1426	4.21	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	16	8	13	2	3		1404/1418	2.24	3.68	4.25	4.20	2.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	13	8	12	4	5	2.52	1376/1416	2.52	3.56	4.26	4.21	2.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	24	6	5	5	1	1	2.22	1171/1199	2.22	3.52	3.97	3.82	2.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	1	Ο	2	1	1	2 17	****/1312	****	3.33	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	3	0	<i>3</i>	1	1		****/1303		3.14	4.24	3.93	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	2	1	2	0	1		****/1299	****	3.13	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	40	4	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 758		3.71	4.01	3.80	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	-	U	U		U		4.00	, 750		3.71	4.01	3.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	45	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	45	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	***

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	В	18						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	9	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	46	Non-major	46
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	16	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	40	-		_	
				?	0						

GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA

Instructor: Tyminski, Frank (Instr. A)

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 230 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 19

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	522/1504	4.25	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	290/1503	4.48	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	488/1290	4.38	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	578/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	392/1421	4.26	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	333/1365	4.34	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	750/1485	4.27	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	854/1504	4.82	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	173/1483	3.82	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	270/1425	4.22	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1426	4.13	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	414/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.20	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	821/1416	3.86	3.56	4.26	4.21	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	2	2	5	3	3.54	908/1199		3.52	3.97	3.82	3.54
Diamondo														
Discussion	10	0	1	_	0	_	0	2 20	1004/1210	1 00	2 22	4 00	2 60	2 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	Τ	2	0	2	∠ 1		1084/1312		3.33	4.00	3.69	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3 2	0	1	∠ 1	1		1232/1303	3.63	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	Т	Τ	3	3.43	1133/1299	3.95	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	44/ 233	4.49	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	38/ 244	4.68	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	57/ 227	4.62	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.81
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	172/ 225	3.67	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	94/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	4.19

Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors			
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA

Instructor: LAIRD, KHOLISWA (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 231 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 19

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	522/1504	4.25	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	290/1503	4.48	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	488/1290	4.38	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	578/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	392/1421	4.26	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	333/1365	4.34	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	10	7	4.26	750/1485	4.27	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	854/1504	4.82	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	2	2	6	1	3.15	1355/1483	3.82	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	۵	0	0	Λ	3	2	_	4 20	1076/1425	1 22	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	3	0	1	∠ 1	4		1381/1426		4.11	4.41	4.56	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	4	6		905/1418		3.68	4.09	4.20	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	1	0	2	_∠	_		1112/1416		3.56	4.25	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	9	0	0	1	1	0		****/1199		3.50	3.97	3.82	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	U	U	1	1	U	3.50	/1199	3.95	3.34	3.97	3.04	3.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1084/1312	4.06	3.33	4.00	3.69	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1232/1303	3.63	3.14	4.24	3.93	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1133/1299	3.95	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	44/ 233	4.49	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	38/ 244		4.05	4.09	4.07	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	57/ 227	4.62	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.81
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	172/ 225	3.67	3.95	4.23	4.01	3.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	94/ 207		3.84		4.01	
Floor		- D.J4	1		_									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5 5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				2	0						

Questionnaires: 18

Title

GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA

Tyminski, Frank (Instr. A)

Instructor: Tyminski, Frank (
Enrollment: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 232 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	1092/1504	4.25	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	751/1503	4.48	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	809/1290	4.38	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	855/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	1	9	4.00	745/1421	4.26	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	681/1365	4.34	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	866/1485	4.27	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	4.82	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	274/1483	3.82	3.64	4.06	3.97	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	300/1425	4.22	3.94	4.41	4.36	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1426	4.13	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	331/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.20	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	837/1416	3.86	3.56	4.26	4.21	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	542/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	572/1312	4.06	3.33	4.00	3.69	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	652/1303	3.63	3.14	4.24	3.93	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	484/1299	3.95	3.13	4.25	3.94	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	3.80	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	94/ 233	4.49	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	71/ 244	4.68	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	29/ 227	4.62	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	96/ 225	3.67	3.95	4.23	4.01	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	124/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.94
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 20	****	***	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA

Instructor: Tyminski, Frank (Instr. A)

Title

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 18 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 232 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Title

GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA

Instructor: VAVILALA, SUMA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

Page 233 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	anier	ncies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean		Mean
x *** *														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	1092/1504	4.25	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	751/1503	4.48	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	809/1290	4.38	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	855/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	1	9	4.00	745/1421	4.26	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	681/1365	4.34	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	866/1485	4.27	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	4.82	4.84	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	4	6	1	3.73	1141/1483	3.82	3.64	4.06	3.97	4.16
T - who are														
Lecture	1.0	0	0	2	0	1	5	1 12	1117/1425	4.22	2 04	1 11	1 20	4 47
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10			2		1	_		, -		3.94	4.41		4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0		2	0	6		1319/1426	4.13	4.11	4.69	4.56	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0 1	2	1	0	5		1013/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.20	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11 10	0 4	0	0	1 1	0	5 3	4.14	961/1416		3.56	4.26	4.21 3.82	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	U	U	1	U	3	4.50	****/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	572/1312	4.06	3.33	4.00	3.69	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	652/1303	3.63	3.14	4.24	3.93	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	484/1299	3.95	3.13	4.25	3.94	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	1	0	2		****/ 758		3.71	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	94/ 233	4.49	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	71/ 244	4.68	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	29/ 227	4.62	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	96/ 225	3.67	3.95	4.23	4.01	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	124/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.94
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	Т	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ /6			4.44	4.51	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
0.15 7 3														
Self Paced	1 7	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 40	****	****	4 52	4 50	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	-	0	0 0	0	0	1		, 10	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0 0			0	1	5.00	, 55	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0		0	0	0	1		****/ 36 ****/ 20			4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	^ ^ <del>*</del> * *	^ ^ * *	4.51	5.00	^ ^ × ×

GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA

Instructor: VAVILALA, SUMA (Instr. B)

Title

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 18 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 233 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				2	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA

POLLACK, RALPHT (Instr. A)

Spring 2005

Page 234
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 18

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NIR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	927/1504	4.25	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	587/1503	4.48	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	661/1290	4.38	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	798/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	479/1421	4.26	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	441/1365		3.75	4.08	3.96	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	670/1485	4.27	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	928/1504	4.82	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1483	3.82	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.22	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1426	4.13	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1416	3.86	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.06	3.33	4.00	3.69	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	2	2		1059/1303	3.63	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	3	2		1017/1299	3.95	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	2	0	0	1	1		****/ 758	****		4.01		****
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	84/ 233	4.49	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	45/ 244	4.68	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	164/ 227	4.62	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	3	1	5	4	1	2.93	215/ 225	3.67	3.95	4.23	4.01	2.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	5	1	3	4	3.29	186/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	***	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
1. Dia bell pacca bybecm conclibate to what you leathed	± /	U	J	J	_	U	U	5.00	/ 40			4.55	4.54	

00.00		0 00 0 00				7.5		~ 1 ·			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	Τ	Graduate	Ü	Major	Ü
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA YMINSKI, FRANK (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 18

Title

Instructor:

Spring 2005

Page 235 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionr	naire
-------------------------------------	-------

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
a 1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	927/1504	4.25	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.22	587/1504	4.48	3.60	4.27	4.13	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	661/1290	4.38	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	798/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.11	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	479/1421	4.26	3.67	4.00	3.91	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	441/1365	4.34	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	670/1485	4.27	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	928/1504	4.82	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	282/1483		3.64	4.06	3.97	3.38
one of the second of the secon	-	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	Ü	ŭ	Ū	1.07	202, 1100	3.02	3.01	1.00	3.77	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	420/1425	4.22	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	572/1426	4.13	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	354/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	324/1416	3.86	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	593/1199	3.95	3.52	3.97	3.82	4.11
_,														
Discussion		0	0	•	-	_	4	4 42	444/1210	4 06	2 22	4 00	2 60	4 42
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312		3.33	4.00	3.69	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	2	2		1059/1303	3.63	3.14	4.24	3.93	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	11 12	0 2	0 2	1	1	3 1	2 1		1017/1299	3.95 ****	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.86 ****
4. Were special techniques successiul	12	2	2	U	U	Τ	Т	2.75	****/ 758		3.71	4.01	3.80	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	84/ 233	4.49	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	45/ 244	4.68	4.05	4.09	4.07	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	164/ 227	4.62	4.16	4.40	4.24	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	3	1	5	4	1	2.93	215/ 225	3.67	3.95	4.23	4.01	2.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	5	1	3	4	3.29	186/ 207	3.73	3.84	4.09	4.01	3.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	1 12	2 62	****
<ol> <li>Did field experience contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria</li> </ol>	17 17	0	0	0	1	0	0 1		****/ 58 ****/ 56	****	3.33 ****	4.43	3.63 4.11	****
2. Did you creatry understand your evaluation criteria	Τ/	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 56			4.43	4.11	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
<del>-</del>														

		0 00 0 00				7.5		~ 1 ·			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	Τ	Graduate	Ü	Major	Ü
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 124L 0103 University of Maryland Page 236 Title GEN ORGANIC BIOCHEM LA Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Instructor: LAIRD, KHOLISWA (Instr. C) Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 19 Ouestionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean

Archerone			_	-	9	-	3	rican	rount	rican	rican	ricari	iicaii	ricari
g1														
General			•	•	•	1.0	_	4 00	005/1504	4 05	2 00	4 00	4 10	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	927/1504	4.25	3.80	4.27	4.13	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44		4.48	3.60	4.20	4.16	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	11			4.38	3.59	4.28	4.19	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	6	6	4.23		4.27	3.76		4.11	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	6	8	4.33			3.67	4.00	3.91	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	441/1365	4.34	3.75	4.08	3.96	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	670/1485	4.27	3.60	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	928/1504	4.82	4.84	4.69	4.66	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	5	4	6	1	0	2.19	1462/1483	3.82	3.64	4.06	3.97	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	2	3	2	0	0	2.00	1415/1425	4.22	3.94	4.41	4.36	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	2	3	1	2	0	2.38	1420/1426	4.13	4.11	4.69	4.56	3.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	3	0	4	0	0	2.14	1408/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.20	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	3	0	2	0	0	1.80	1407/1416	3.86	3.56	4.26	4.21	3.28
•														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.06	3.33	4.00	3.69	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	2				3.63		4.24	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	1	3	2			3.95	3.13	4.25	3.94	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	2	0	0	1	1		****/ 758	****			3.80	****
1. Were special tecimiques successful			2	O	O	_	_	2.75	7 730		3.71	1.01	3.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	84/ 233	4.49	3.96	4.09	3.90	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	- ,		4.05		4.07	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29		4.62			4.24	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	3	1	5	4		2.93		3.67			4.01	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	5	1	3		3.29	186/ 207				4.01	
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	4	U	1	5		3	4	3.43	100/ 20/	3.73	3.04	4.03	4.01	3.49
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 73	****				****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	1 /	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ /3			4.1/	3.03	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.11	****
out of the first and the first of		3	3	9	J	J	_	2.00	, 30					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
		•	Ü	•	_	•	ŭ	5.00	, 10					

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

3	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
5	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
3	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there ar	e not enough	ı
			P	0			responses to	be signi	ficant	
			I	0	Other	14				
			?	0						
	3 5 3 1 0	5 1.00-1.99 3 2.00-2.99 1 3.00-3.49	5 1.00-1.99 0 3 2.00-2.99 2 1 3.00-3.49 8	5 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 1 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 3.50-4.00 3 F	5 1.00-1.99 0 B 14 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 1 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 P 0	5 1.00-1.99 0 B 14 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 1 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives P 0 I 0 Other	5 1.00-1.99 0 B 14 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 0 1 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 P 0 I 0 Other 14	5 1.00-1.99 0 B 14 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 1 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means P 0 I 0 Other 14	5 1.00-1.99 0 B 14 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 18 1 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there ar responses to be signi I 0 Other 14	5 1.00-1.99 0 B 14 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 18 Non-major 1 3.00-3.49 8 D 0 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 14

University of Maryland PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY II Baltimore County Spring 2005

Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY

Self Paced

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

Enrollment: 42

Title

Ouestionnaires: 29 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Ouestions 1 2 3 4 5 Mean NR NA Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 17 4.34 775/1504 4.34 3.80 4.27 4.27 4.34 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 4.20 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3.79 1192/1503 3.79 3.60 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 10 3.93 996/1290 3.93 3.59 4.28 4.31 3.93 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 12 4.00 1001/1453 4.00 3.76 4.21 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 11 3.88 879/1421 3.88 3.67 4.00 4.01 3.88 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 4.06 754/1365 4.06 3.75 4.08 1 10 4.08 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 1 6 16 4.29 727/1485 4.29 3.60 4.16 4.17 4.29 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 27 4.93 460/1504 4.93 4.84 4.69 4.65 4.93 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 4 4 3.56 1211/1483 3.56 3.64 4.06 4.08 3.56 Lecture 0 0 7 17 4.34 961/1425 4.34 3.94 4.41 4.43 4.34 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 21 4.66 981/1426 4.66 4.11 4.69 4.71 4.66 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3.55 1237/1418 3.55 3.68 4.25 4.26 3.55 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 14 3.97 1057/1416 3.97 3.56 4.26 4.27 3.97 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 12 4.17 561/1199 4.17 3.52 3.97 4.02 4.17 1 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 4 3.75 902/1312 3.75 3.33 4.00 4.09 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 4.38 701/1303 4.38 3.14 4.24 4.27 4.38 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 21 0 4.38 705/1299 4.38 3.13 4.25 4.30 4. Were special techniques successful 3 4.40 ****/ 758 **** 3.71 4.01 4.00 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 28 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 233 **** 3.96 4.09 4.12 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.05 4.09 4.20 **** 28 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0 5.00 ****/ 227 * * * * 4.16 28 4.40 4.46 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 28 0 5.00 ****/ 225 **** 3.95 4.23 4.29 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2.8 0 1 5.00 ****/ 207 **** 3.84 4.09 4.14 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 28 0 0 0 5.00 ****/ 76 **** **** 4.61 4.84 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 28 0 5.00 ****/ 70 **** 4.35 4.24 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 0 5.00 ****/ 67 * * * * 4.34 3.98 **** 2.8 *** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 28 0 5.00 ****/ 76 4.44 4.51 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 28 0 5.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.17 4.25 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 5.00 ****/ 3.33 4.43 4.52 *** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 28 0 0 5.00 ****/ 56 4.23 4.13 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 28 0 5.00 ****/ 44 4.65 4.77 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 28 0 0 5.00 ****/ 47 **** *** 4.29 4.14 **** 1 5.00 ****/ 39 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 28 0 **** * * * *

28

0

Page 237

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

0 1 5.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.53 4.74 ****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	***	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY II

Instructor:

ARNOLD, BRADLEY Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 237 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	lits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Reasons		Type		Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	21
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 303 0101

Title PHYS CHEM FOR BIOCHEM

Instructor: KELLY, LISA A.

Enrollment: 61
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 238 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequenc			ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	-	0	^	0	2	_	1 -	4 20	020/1504	4 20	2 00	4 00	4 00	4 20
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	/	15	4.30	838/1504		3.80	4.27	4.27	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	./	16	4.37	692/1503	4.37	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.41	642/1290		3.59	4.28	4.31	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	752/1453	4.27	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	6	6	10	3.96	804/1421	3.96	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	187/1365	4.67	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	6	16	4.38	613/1485	4.38	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	3	9	6	3.90	989/1483	3.90	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.90
Lecture														
	4	0	0	0	1	_	18	4.71	510/1425	4.71	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.71
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		•	0	0	1	2			,					
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	8	15		1065/1426	4.58	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	4	/	11		1000/1418	4.04	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	0	4	17	4.33	806/1416	4.33	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	736/1199	3.92	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	Λ	1	1	Ω	1	3 33	****/1312	****	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	1	0	1	2		****/1303	****	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	2	1		****/1299	****	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	٥	0	U T	_	1		****/ 758	****	3.13	4.25	4.00	***
i. Were special techniques successivi	4	3	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ /50		3.11	4.UI	4.00	

Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	28
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0101
Title ADVANCED LAB II

Questionnaires: 1

ADVANCED LAB II

Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 12

Baltimore County
Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Page 239

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Frequencies			;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1501/1504	1.00	3.80	4.27	4.27	1.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1503	1.00	3.60	4.20	4.22	1.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.00	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1359/1365	2.00	3.75	4.08	4.08	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	990/1485	4.00	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1468/1483	3.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	2.50	3.94	4.41	4.43	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	3.75	4.11	4.69	4.71	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1416/1418	2.00	3.68	4.25	4.26	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1412/1416	1.25	3.56	4.26	4.27	1.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1181/1199	2.00	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1297/1303	1.00	3.14	4.24	4.27	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1294/1299	1.00	3.13	4.25	4.30	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material			Ο	1	0	Ο	0	2.00	226/ 233	2.00	3.96	4.09	4.12	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	235/ 244	2.00	4.05	4.09	4.20	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	218/ 225	2.00	3.95	4.23	4.29	2.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 207	4.00	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00
o. Here required for two reports ofederly specifical	J	J	J	J	J	_	•	1.00	200, 201	1.00	3.01	1.00		

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0101 Title

12

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

ADVANCED LAB II

Instructor: KE, HAOHAO (Instr. B) University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 240 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies			3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1501/1504	1.00	3.80	4.27	4.27	1.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1503	1.00	3.60	4.20	4.22	1.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.00	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1359/1365	2.00	3.75	4.08	4.08	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		990/1485	4.00	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1422/1425	2.50	3.94	4.41	4.43	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1406/1426	3.75	4.11	4.69	4.71	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1416/1418	2.00	3.68	4.25	4.26	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1412/1416	1.25	3.56	4.26	4.27	1.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1297/1303	1.00	3.14	4.24	4.27	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1294/1299	1.00	3.13	4.25	4.30	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	226/ 233	2.00	3.96	4.09	4.12	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	235/ 244	2.00	4.05	4.09	4.20	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	218/ 225	2.00	3.95	4.23	4.29	2.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 207	4.00	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0101 Title

ADVANCED LAB II

KISER, JOHN (Instr. C) Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 241 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 1

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		Frequencies				3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1501/1504	1.00	3.80	4.27	4.27	1.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1503	1.00	3.60	4.20	4.22	1.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.00	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1359/1365	2.00	3.75	4.08	4.08	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	990/1485	4.00	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	3.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1367/1425	2.50	3.94	4.41	4.43	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1319/1426	3.75	4.11	4.69	4.71	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		1330/1418	2.00	3.68	4.25	4.26	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1401/1416	1.25	3.56	4.26	4.27	1.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1181/1199	2.00	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.00
~.														
Discussion	^	0	0	_	-	_	_	2 00	1140/1210	2 00	2 22	4 00	4 00	2 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	Τ	0	0		1149/1312	3.00	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		1297/1303	1.00	3.14	4.24	4.27	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1294/1299	1.00	3.13	4.25	4.30	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	226/ 233	2.00	3.96	4.09	4.12	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	235/ 244	2.00	4.05	4.09	4.20	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	218/ 225	2.00	3.95	4.23	4.29	2.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 207	4.00	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00

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

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 0101 Title

12

Enrollment:

ADVANCED LAB II

SAUER, SCOTT Instructor: (Instr. D)

Baltimore County Spring 2005

University of Maryland

Page 242 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Questionnaires.	<u> </u>	beauciic	COULBC	Evaluation	Quescromatic

	Frequencies				Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 1501/150	4 1.00	3.80	4.27	4.27	1.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 1499/150	3 1.00	3.60	4.20	4.22	1.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 1404/145	3 3.00	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 1359/136	5 2.00	3.75	4.08	4.08	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 990/148	5 4.00	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 1411/150	4 4.00	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 1379/148	3 3.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.00
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 1422/142	5 2.50	3.94	4.41	4.43	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 1406/142		4.11	4.69	4.71	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 1330/141		3.68	4.25	4.26	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 1412/141	6 1.25	3.56	4.26	4.27	1.25
Discussion													
	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 1149/131	2 3.00	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	Ū	0	0	0	Τ	0	0	1.00 1297/130		3.33	4.00	4.09	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0		1	0	0	-	-						
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	Τ	U	0	0	0	1.00 1294/129	9 1.00	3.13	4.25	4.30	1.00
Laboratory													
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 226/ 23	3 2.00	3.96	4.09	4.12	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 235/ 24	4 2.00	4.05	4.09	4.20	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 218/ 22	5 2.00	3.95	4.23	4.29	2.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 106/ 20	7 4.00	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00

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

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I

Title Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES

Enrollment: 172 Questionnaires: 63 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 243 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Ouestions	NR	NΑ	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General														
	n new insights,skills from this course	2	0	4	3	9	19	26		1112/1504		3.80	4.27	4.27	3.98
	tructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	9	9	17	24		1159/1503	3.85	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.85
	m questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	3	7	9	13	27		1013/1290		3.59	4.28	4.31	3.92
	valuations reflect the expected goals	3	38	3	4	3	6	6		1341/1453		3.76	4.21	4.23	3.36
	d readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	4	2	11	15	23	3.93	839/1421	3.93	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.93
	assignments contribute to what you learned	4	42	1	3	2	3	8	3.82	954/1365		3.75	4.08	4.08	3.82
	ding system clearly explained	4	2	4	4	15	14	20		1188/1485		3.60	4.16	4.17	3.74
=	mes was class cancelled	5	4	0	0	1	2	51	4.93	,		4.84	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would yo	ou grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	2	2	7	19	11	3.85	1041/1483	3.85	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.85
	Lecture														
1. Were the in	structor's lectures well prepared	9	0	2	0	4	17	31	4.39	920/1425	4.39	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.39
	tructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	1	1	11	40		1022/1426	4.63	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.63
	material presented and explained clearly	10	0	3	2	15	13	20		1123/1418	3.85	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.85
	tures contribute to what you learned	9	2	1	3	9	10	29	4.21	904/1416		3.56	4.26	4.27	4.21
5. Did audiovi	sual techniques enhance your understanding	10	24	2	4	4	7	12	3.79	800/1199	3.79	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.79
1. Did class d	Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned				3	2	4	3	3.21	****/1312	***	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all st	udents actively encouraged to participate	49	0	1	2	4	3	4	3.50	****/1303	***	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
	tructor encourage fair and open discussion	49	0	1	3	3	3	4	3.43	****/1299	***	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
	l techniques successful	49	8	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 758	***	3.71	4.01	4.00	***
	Laboratory														
1 Did the lab	increase understanding of the material	58	1	1	0	0	1	2	3 75	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	4.12	****
	ovided with adequate background information	59	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	4.20	****
	ary materials available for lab activities	59	1	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 227	***	4.16	4.40	4.46	****
	instructor provide assistance	59	0	1	0	1	0	2		****/ 225	***	3.95	4.23	4.29	****
	ements for lab reports clearly specified	59	1	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 207	***	3.84	4.09	4.14	***
	Seminar														
4 Did present:	ations contribute to what you learned	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
	ia for grading made clear	62	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 73	***	****	4.17	4.25	****
										,					
	Field Work														
	xperience contribute to what you learned	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	***	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
	arly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 56	***	****	4.23	4.13	****
	tructor available for consultation	62	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 44	***	****	4.65	4.77	****
_	ree could you discuss your evaluations	62 62	0	1 1	0	0	0	0		****/ 47	***	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did confere	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities					0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
	Self Paced														
1. Did self-pa	ced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study q	uestions make clear the expected goal	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	***	****	4.49	4.36	****
-	. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feed	dback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	***	****	4.24	5.00	****

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I

Instructor:

FISHBEIN, JAMES

Enrollment: 172
Questionnaires: 63

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 243 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	В	21						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	8	С	14	General	0	Under-grad	63	Non-major	63
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	2	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	51				
				?	2						

Title

Instructor:

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)

Spring 2005

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 244 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	15				
Questionnaires:	14	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	6	2	2 50	1353/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	-	2		1340/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	4	∠ 1		1155/1290	3.73	3.59	4.28	4.22	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	2	-		1136/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	3	2	0		1402/1421	3.90	3.67	4.00	4.23	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	6	3	3		1003/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.01	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	2	4	2		1387/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10		940/1504		4.84	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	6	5	0		1372/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.38
7. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	_	4	U	J	U	3.07	13/2/1403	3.00	3.01	4.00	<b>4.</b> 00	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1267/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	1319/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	4	2	5	3.64	1209/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	5	2	3.29	1290/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	3	3	4	0	2.91	1098/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	2	1		1070/1312		3.33	4.00	4.09	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	910/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	855/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.92	158/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	158/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	3.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	4	Ω	4.54	118/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	2	3	0	2	6	3.54	193/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	139/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.85
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	Τ.	U	U	Τ.	3	U	3	3.05	139/ 40/	3.19	3.04	±.∪9	4.14	3.03

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

Title

Instructor:

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

NOKOLA, GOKAL (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 245 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	<b>1</b>					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	6	2	3.50	1353/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	5	2		1340/1503		3.60	4.20	4.22	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	4	4		1155/1290		3.59	4.28	4.31	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	5		1136/1453		3.76	4.21	4.23	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	3	2	0		1402/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	6	3	3		1003/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	2	4	2	3.00	1387/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	940/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	1157/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	1	Ω	3	2	3 25	1346/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	2	4	1		1381/1426		4.11	4.69	4.71	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	1	2	3		1217/1418		3.68	4.25	4.26	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	3	2	1		1324/1416		3.56	4.26	4.27	3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	1	3	1	0		1125/1199		3.52	3.97	4.02	
5. Did dudiovibual econniques emidiee four understanding	3	3	_	_	3	_	Ü	2.07	1123/1177	3.32	3.32	3.7,	1.02	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1070/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	910/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	855/1299		3.13	4.25	4.30	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	158/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	158/ 244		4.05	4.09	4.20	3.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	118/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	2	3	0	2	6	3.54	193/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	139/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.85

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

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 246 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	requenc		4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
					3 									
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	0	9	3	3.93	1173/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	9	4	4.14	954/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	6	3	3.53	1147/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	890/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	7	2	3.57	1073/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	782/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	0	6	6	4.14	890/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1504		4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1197/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.80
Lecture	_		_		_		_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	700/1425		3.94	4.41	4.43	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2 2	0	0	0	2	2	10		1073/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly			1	1	2	4	6		1081/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	./	4		1029/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	636/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1.0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4 22	F20/1210	2 52	2 22	4 00	4 00	1 22
	10 10	0	1	1	0 1	4	2	4.33	530/1312 1153/1303	3.53 3.60	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	0	3		1078/1299		3.14	4.24	4.27 4.30	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	3 1		****/ 758		3.13	4.25	4.00	3.07 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	ТТ	3	U	U	U	Т	Т	4.50	/ /56	4.13	3./1	4.01	4.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	Ο	1	1	8	4.36	96/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	58/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	92/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	49/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	75/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.36
J. Here regarrements for tab reports ofearly specified	,	U	J	O	_	5	5	1.50	75, 207	3.75	3.01	1.00	1.11	1.50
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				2	0						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

SHUKLA, BRAHMI (Instr. B)

Baltimore County

Page 247 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2005

University of Maryland

			Fre	-	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	0	9	3	3.93	1173/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	9	4		954/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	6	3		1147/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	890/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	7	2	3.57	1073/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	782/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	0	6	6	4.14	890/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	850/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.80
T o obvies														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	0	2	_	4 75	400/1405	4 00	2 04	1 11	4 42	1 ((
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	∠ 1	6	4.75	420/1425	4.08		4.41	4.43	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	Ţ	/	4.88	- ,	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	,	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	5	_	4.29	845/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	530/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1153/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1078/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	96/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	58/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	92/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	49/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	75/ 207	3.79	3.84			4.36
T		<b>.</b>	.,											

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				2	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Page 248
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 18

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies		_		tructor		_	UMBC Level		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4 33	788/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	1	6		1127/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	902/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	878/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	3	0	5		1056/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	1	4		1084/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	761/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	591/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	3	1	1		1197/1483			4.06	4.08	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	0	1	7	4.20	1076/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	1248/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1013/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1158/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1106/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.83
Discussion	г	0	0	1	0	2	2	1 1 1	662/1210	2 [2	2 22	4 00	4 00	1 1 1
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0 1	1 1	0	3 2	3	4.14			3.33	4.00	4.09	4.14 3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1059/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24 4.25	4.27 4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	5 5	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	922/1299 557/ 758	3.44 4.13	3.13 3.71	4.25	4.30	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	Τ	U	Т	Т	۷	3.60	55// /58	4.13	3./1	4.01	4.00	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	143/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	162/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	3.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	147/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	169/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	106/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	,	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
5. Were effected for grading made effect		O	O	O	O	_	O	1.00	, , , , ,			1.1/	1.25	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	3.33	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.44	4.47	***
0-15 2 1														
Self Paced  1. Did colf paced gystem contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 40	****	****	/ E2	1 71	***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 40			4.53	4.74	

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/	35	***	***	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	36	***	***	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 248 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 12

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_		-	
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB Instructor: YILDIZ, FATMA (Instr. B)

Page 249 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2005

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 12

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	anier	ncies			Tngi	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	788/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	1	6		1127/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	902/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	878/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	3	0	5	3.60	1056/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	1	4	3.64	1084/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	761/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	591/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	543/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	285/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	_		171/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	0	4		1122/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	0	1	0	1		****/1199		3.52	3.97		2.83
J. Did addiovisual techniques chilanee your understanding	,	J	O	O		U	_	4.00	/ 11//	3.32	3.32	3.77	4.02	2.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	663/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1059/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	922/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	557/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	3.60
Laboratory	0	0	0	0	4	_		4 00	142/022	4 00	2 06	4 00	4 10	4 00
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	143/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	162/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	3.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0 1	2	2		4.40	147/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1 1		1 2	2		3.90	169/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	U	Τ	0	2	2	5	4.00	106/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 67	***	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	***	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	***	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 58	3.33	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 56	****	****	4.43	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	***	****	4.65	4.13	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.77	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.14	****
J. Dia conferences help you early out field accivities		U	J	_	J	J	U	2.00	, 39			1.11	1.1/	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	***

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: YILDIZ, FATMA (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Spring 2005 Page 249 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 12

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)

Page 250

JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	0	4	4	5	3.50	1353/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	3	3.63	1263/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	5	4	3.56	1140/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	968/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	3	4	3	3.21	1252/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	9	3	3.81	960/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	6	4	2	3.19	1362/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1157/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	5	4		1267/1425	4.08	3.94		4.43	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	7		1183/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	1	7	2		1291/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	2	1	3	5		1238/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1013/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.22
Di a su su di su														
Discussion	1.0	0	_	^	0	1	0	0 00	**** /1210	2 52	2 22	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	0	1	0		****/1312			4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	-	0	1	0	2	0		****/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	2	0		****/1299	3.44		4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	U	U	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	4.13	3./1	4.01	4.00	^ ^ ^ ^
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	0	2	7	4	3.73	178/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	3	5		4.07	143/ 244		4.05	4.09	4.20	4.07
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	2		4.53	118/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	0	8		4.27	135/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	7	2	5	3.73	151/ 207		3.84	4.09		3.73
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified		U	U		,	2	J	3.73	131/ 207	3.75	3.01	4.00	4.14	3.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	***	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	***	***	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	***	***	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	***	***	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work			_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 58	3.33	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
1. Did beil-paced system contribute to what you fedflied	10	U	U	_	U	U	U	∠.00	/ 40			T.33	I./I	

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/	16	***	****	4.51	3.95	****

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 250 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB STAROSCIAK, AMY (Instr. B) Page 251 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

Title

Instructor:

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	anier	ncies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	0	4	4	5	3.50	1353/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	3		1263/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	5	4	3.56	1140/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	968/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	3	4	3	3.21	1252/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	9	3	3.81	960/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	6	4	2		1362/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	700/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	6	3	4 20	1076/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	6	2		1319/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	5	_	4.30	799/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	2	2	3		1199/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	0	0	1	0	1		****/1199		3.52	3.97		3.22
J. Did addiovisual techniques chilanee your understanding	,	,	O	O		U	_	4.00	/ 1100	3.32	3.32	3.77	4.02	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
- 1														
Laboratory	-1	0	0	0	0	_		2 52	150 / 022	4 00	2 06	4 00	4 10	2 52
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	0	2	7	4	3.73	178/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	3	5		4.07	143/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.07
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1 1	1	2		4.53	118/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0		0 7	8		4.27	135/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	/	2	5	3.73	151/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	***	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	Λ	2 00	****/ 58	3.33	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 56	****	****	4.43	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.05	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.14	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out fred accivities	10	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 39			1.11	1.1/	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 ****/	16	***	****	4.51	3.95	****

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor:

Title STAROSCIAK, AMY (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16

Spring 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

# Frequency Distribution

Credita	s Earned		Cum. GF	PA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.0	 00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.0	00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.0	00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0 C	3.0	00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.	50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
					P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
					I	0	Other	12				
					?	2						

Page 251

JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A) Instructor:

Enrollment: 13 Que

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 252 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

uestionnaires:	9	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

				_	ncies	3			ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1302/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1331/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1109/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1123/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1286/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	782/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1265/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1009/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	971/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1089/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1201/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1158/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	771/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	137/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	136/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	82/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	136/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	4	1	2	3.33	182/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.33

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_		_	
				Ş	0						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor:

YILDIZ, FATMA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 9

28-55

56-83

84-150

Grad.

3

2

1

1.00-1.99

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

1

В

C

D

Ρ

I

5

0

0

0

0

0

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 253

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1302/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	1		1331/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	2		1109/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	1		1123/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1286/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	782/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1265/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	3.56	1215/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1165/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	0	3		1319/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	1	2		1128/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	2	1		1248/1416		3.56	4.26	4.27	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	1	0	1		987/1199		3.52		4.02	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5 00	****/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 758		3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.11	137/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	136/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	82/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	136/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	4	1	2	3.33	182/ 207		3.84	4.09		3.33
Frem	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
_	y	210												
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5 			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0

General

Other

Electives

0

0

9

responses to be significant

#### - Means there are not enough

Under-grad

Non-major

9

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)

Instructor: WHAI Enrollment: 14

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 254
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 4 3.82 1178/1503 3.73 3.60 4.20 4.22 3 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 0 0 3 4 3.27 1207/1290 3.52 3.59 4.28 4.31 3 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 0 1 4 2 3.00 1404/1453 3.90 3.76 4.21 4.23 3 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 4 1 1 3 2 2.82 1357/1421 3.06 3.67 4.00 4.01 2 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 1 1 2 3 3.10 1285/1365 3.70 3.75 4.08 4.08 3 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 3 1 2 3 2 3.00 1387/1485 3.53 3.60 4.16 4.17 3 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 1/1504 4.94 4.84 4.69 4.65 5 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 1 0 0 6 1 3.75 1123/1483 3.80 3.64 4.06 4.08 3	ect lean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 2 1 0 5 3 3.55 1340/1504 3.79 3.80 4.27 4.27 3 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 4 4 3.82 1178/1503 3.73 3.60 4.20 4.22 3 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 0 0 3 4 3.27 1207/1290 3.52 3.59 4.28 4.31 3 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 0 1 4 2 3.00 1404/1453 3.90 3.76 4.21 4.23 3 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 4 1 1 3 2 2.82 1357/1421 3.06 3.67 4.00 4.01 2 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 1 1 2 3 3.10 1285/1365 3.70 3.75 4.08 4.08 3 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 3 1 2 3 2 3.00 1387/1485 3.53 3.60 4.16 4.17 3 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1504 4.94 4.84 4.69 4.65 5 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 1 0 0 6 1 3.75 1123/1483 3.80 3.64 4.06 4.08 3 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 2 2 1 3 3 3.27 1342/1425 4.08 3.94 4.41 4.43 3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1128/1426 4.28 4.11 4.69 4.71 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 1 2 3 3 3.18 1306/1416 3.66 3.56 4.26 4.27 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 3 1 1 3 0 2.50 1138/1199 3.32 3.52 3.97 4.02 2	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 4 3.82 1178/1503 3.73 3.60 4.20 4.22 3 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 0 0 3 4 3.27 1207/1290 3.52 3.59 4.28 4.31 3 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 0 1 4 2 3.00 1404/1453 3.90 3.76 4.21 4.23 3 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 4 1 1 3 2 2.82 1357/1421 3.06 3.67 4.00 4.01 2 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 1 1 2 3 3.10 1285/1365 3.70 3.75 4.08 4.08 3 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 3 1 2 3 2 3.00 1387/1485 3.53 3.60 4.16 4.17 3 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 1/1504 4.94 4.84 4.69 4.65 5 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 1 0 0 6 1 3.75 1123/1483 3.80 3.64 4.06 4.08 3 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 2 2 1 3 3 3 3.27 1342/1425 4.08 3.94 4.41 4.43 3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1128/1426 4.28 4.11 4.69 4.71 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 1 2 3 3 3.18 1306/1416 3.66 3.56 4.26 4.27 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 3 1 1 3 0 2.50 1138/1199 3.32 3.52 3.97 4.02 2	. 55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 0 0 3 4 3.27 1207/1290 3.52 3.59 4.28 4.31 3 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 0 1 4 2 3.00 1404/1453 3.90 3.76 4.21 4.23 3 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 4 1 1 3 2 2.82 1357/1421 3.06 3.67 4.00 4.01 2 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 1 1 2 3 3.10 1285/1365 3.70 3.75 4.08 4.08 3 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 3 1 2 3 2 3.00 1387/1485 3.53 3.60 4.16 4.17 3 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1504 4.94 4.84 4.69 4.65 5 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 1 0 0 0 6 1 3.75 1123/1483 3.80 3.64 4.06 4.08 3 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 2 2 1 3 3 3 3.27 1342/1425 4.08 3.94 4.41 4.43 3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1128/1426 4.28 4.11 4.69 4.71 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 1 2 3 3 3.18 1306/1416 3.66 3.56 4.25 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 0 3 2 3 3.18 1306/1416 3.66 3.56 4.26 4.27 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 3 1 1 3 0 2.50 1138/1199 3.32 3.52 3.97 4.02 2	.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 4 0 1 4 2 3.00 1404/1453 3.90 3.76 4.21 4.23 3 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 4 1 1 3 2 2.82 1357/1421 3.06 3.67 4.00 4.01 2 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 1 1 2 3 3.10 1285/1365 3.70 3.75 4.08 4.08 3 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 3 1 2 3 2 3.00 1387/1485 3.53 3.60 4.16 4.17 3 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1504 4.94 4.84 4.69 4.65 5 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 1 0 0 6 1 3.75 1123/1483 3.80 3.64 4.06 4.08 3 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 2 2 1 3 3 3.27 1342/1425 4.08 3.94 4.41 4.43 3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1128/1426 4.28 4.11 4.69 4.71 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 1 2 3 3 3.36 1289/1418 3.90 3.68 4.25 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 3 0 3 2 3 3.18 1306/1416 3.66 3.56 4.26 4.27 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 3 1 1 3 0 2.50 1138/1199 3.32 3.52 3.97 4.02 2	.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 4 1 1 3 2 2.82 1357/1421 3.06 3.67 4.00 4.01 2 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 1 1 2 3 3.10 1285/1365 3.70 3.75 4.08 4.08 3 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 3 1 2 3 2 3.00 1387/1485 3.53 3.60 4.16 4.17 3 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1504 4.94 4.84 4.69 4.65 5 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 1 0 0 6 1 3.75 1123/1483 3.80 3.64 4.06 4.08 3 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 2 2 2 1 3 3 3.27 1342/1425 4.08 3.94 4.41 4.43 3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1128/1426 4.28 4.11 4.69 4.71 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 1 2 3 3 3.36 1289/1418 3.90 3.68 4.25 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 0 3 2 3 3.18 1306/1416 3.66 3.56 4.26 4.27 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 3 1 1 3 0 2.50 1138/1199 3.32 3.52 3.97 4.02 2	.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 1 1 2 3 3.10 1285/1365 3.70 3.75 4.08 4.08 3 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 3 1 2 3 2 3.00 1387/1485 3.53 3.60 4.16 4.17 3 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1504 4.94 4.84 4.69 4.65 5 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 1 0 0 6 1 3.75 1123/1483 3.80 3.64 4.06 4.08 3    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 2 2 1 3 3 3.27 1342/1425 4.08 3.94 4.41 4.43 3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1128/1426 4.28 4.11 4.69 4.71 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 1 2 3 3 3.36 1289/1418 3.90 3.68 4.25 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 0 3 2 3 3.18 1306/1416 3.66 3.56 4.26 4.27 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 3 1 1 3 0 2.50 1138/1199 3.32 3.52 3.97 4.02 2	.82
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1504 4.94 4.84 4.69 4.65 5 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 1 0 0 6 1 3.75 1123/1483 3.80 3.64 4.06 4.08 3  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 2 2 1 3 3 3.27 1342/1425 4.08 3.94 4.41 4.43 3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1128/1426 4.28 4.11 4.69 4.71 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 1 2 3 3 3.36 1289/1418 3.90 3.68 4.25 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 0 3 2 3 3.18 1306/1416 3.66 3.56 4.26 4.27 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 3 1 1 3 0 2.50 1138/1199 3.32 3.52 3.97 4.02 2	.10
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. 1 1 0 0 6 1 3.75 1123/1483 3.80 3.64 4.06 4.08 3  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  7. Discussion  Lecture  8. Did 1 3.75 1123/1483 3.80 3.64 4.06 4.08 3  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 1 0 0 0 6 1 3.75 1123/1483 3.80 3.64 4.06 4.08 3  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 1 0 0 0 6 1 3.75 1123/1483 3.80 3.64 4.06 4.08 3  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 1 0 0 0 6 1 3.75 1123/1483 3.80 3.64 4.06 4.08 3  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  9. 0 0 2 2 1 3 3 3.27 1342/1425 4.08 3.94 4.41 4.43 3  1. 0 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1128/1426 4.28 4.11 4.69 4.71 4  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  1. 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1128/1425 4.08 3.94 4.41 4.43 3  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1. 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1128/1425 4.08 3.94 4.41 4.43 3  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  9. 0 2 1 2 3 3 3.36 1289/1418 3.90 3.68 4.25 4.26 3  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  9. 0 3 0 3 2 3 3.18 1306/1416 3.66 3.56 4.26 4.27 3  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  9. 3 1 1 3 0 2.50 1138/1199 3.32 3.52 3.97 4.02 2	.00
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  Discussion  Lecture  0 0 2 2 1 3 3 3.27 1342/1425 4.08 3.94 4.41 4.43 3 3. 3. 36 4.50 1128/1426 4.28 4.11 4.69 4.71 4 3. 3 3 3.36 1289/1418 3.90 3.68 4.25 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  0 0 3 0 3 2 3 3.18 1306/1416 3.66 3.56 4.26 4.27 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  Discussion	.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 2 2 1 3 3 3.27 1342/1425 4.08 3.94 4.41 4.43 3 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1128/1426 4.28 4.11 4.69 4.71 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 1 2 3 3 3.36 1289/1418 3.90 3.68 4.25 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 0 3 2 3 3.18 1306/1416 3.66 3.56 4.26 4.27 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 3 1 1 3 0 2.50 1138/1199 3.32 3.52 3.97 4.02 2	.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 1128/1426 4.28 4.11 4.69 4.71 4 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 1 2 3 3 3.36 1289/1418 3.90 3.68 4.25 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 0 3 2 3 3.18 1306/1416 3.66 3.56 4.26 4.27 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 3 1 1 3 0 2.50 1138/1199 3.32 3.52 3.97 4.02 2	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 2 1 2 3 3 3.36 1289/1418 3.90 3.68 4.25 4.26 3 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 0 3 2 3 3.18 1306/1416 3.66 3.56 4.26 4.27 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 3 1 1 3 0 2.50 1138/1199 3.32 3.52 3.97 4.02 2 Discussion	.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 0 3 2 3 3.18 1306/1416 3.66 3.56 4.26 4.27 3 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 3 1 1 3 0 2.50 1138/1199 3.32 3.52 3.97 4.02 2 Discussion	.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 3 1 1 3 0 2.50 1138/1199 3.32 3.52 3.97 4.02 2  Discussion	.68
Discussion	.45
	.63
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 3 0 2 1 1 2.57 1237/1312 3.53 3.33 4.00 4.09 2	.57
<u>.</u>	.14
	.14
	***
Laboratory	
	.50
	.75
	.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 2 0 2 2 3.25 201/225 4.18 3.95 4.23 4.29 3	.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified $3 \ 0 \ 2 \ 0 \ 3 \ 1 \ 2 \ 3.13 \ 195/ \ 207 \ 3.79 \ 3.84 \ 4.09 \ 4.14 \ 3$	.13
Seminar	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $9$ 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 ****/ 76 **** **** 4.61 4.84 *	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 2 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 70 **** 4.35 4.24 **	***
Field Work	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8 0 1 0 0 1 1 3.33 50/ 58 3.33 3.33 4.43 4.52 3	.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 9 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 56 **** **** 4.23 4.13 *	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 8 1 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 44 **** **** 4.65 4.77 *	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 8 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 47 **** **** 4.29 4.14 *	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 8 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.44 4.47 **	***
Self Paced	
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.53 4.74 *	***
	***
	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 9 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 20 **** **** 4.24 5.00 **	***

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title

Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 11 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 254 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	 2	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0 Other		7	-			
				?	0						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

SKUKLA, BRAHMI (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 11

Title

Instructor:

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 255
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

G 1 1 1	~		<u> </u>
Student	('Ollrse	Evaluation.	Ouestionnaire

	Frequencies				s Instructor		Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect			
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	0	5	3	3.55	1340/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1178/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	0	0	3	4	3.27	1207/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	0	1	4	2	3.00	1404/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	1	3	2	2.82	1357/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	2.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	1	2	3	3.10	1285/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	2	3	2	3.00	1387/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1123/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.75
Lecture		_	_	_	_		_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	4	1		1234/1425	4.08	3.94		4.43	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	2	1	3		1376/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	1	3		1013/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	1	3		1184/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1115/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	2.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	2	1	1	2 57	1237/1312	3.53	3 33	4.00	4.09	2.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	2	1	2		1185/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	0	1	2	0		1270/1299	3.44		4.25	4.30	2.14
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 758			4.01	4.00	****
1. Were special ecciniques successivi	-	O	O	Ü	O	-	O	1.00	, , , 50	1.13	3.71	1.01	1.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	0	0	4	2	3.50	190/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	183/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	142/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	201/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	195/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.13
Seminar	0	0	-1	^	0	1	0	0 50	****/ 7C		4444	1 61	4 0 4	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9 8	0 2	1	0	0	U T	0	2.50	,	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	2	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 70	^ ^ ^ ^	^ ^ ^ ^	4.35	4.24	^ ^ ^ ^
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	50/ 58	3.33	3.33	4.43	4.52	3.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced			_	_	_		_	0 0 0	and and the second	4.4.4.4		4		4.4.1.1
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9 9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal			1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	***	****	4.24	5.00	****

Title

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: SKUKLA, BRAHMI (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 11 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 255 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	 2	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0 Other		7	-			
				?	0						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: WHALEN, DALE L (Instr. A)

~ 7\\

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 256 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 7

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1010/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	3		1052/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	1	2		1236/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	741/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	1353/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1104/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	890/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1340/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1 12	076/1/05	4 00	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.41
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	•	-	ŭ	0	1	2			876/1425	4.08		4.41		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0 2	0	0	2 1			1183/1426 1181/1418	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71 4.26	4.31 3.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	1	4		1264/1416	3.90	3.56	4.25	4.26	3.41
<u>-</u>	0	1	∠ 1	0	2	2	1	3.43	987/1199	3.32	3.50	3.97		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	Т	Т	U	2	2	Т	3.33	987/1199	3.34	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1195/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1239/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	2.67
- 1														
Laboratory	-1	0	_	-	0	_	_	4 50	E1 / 022	4 02	2 06	4 00	4 10	4 50
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	Ţ	0	0	5	4.50	71/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	83/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1 1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	82/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance		0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	U	2	2	2	4.00	106/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
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	1
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	0						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title

HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. B) Instructor:

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 7

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 257 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Ouestions				_	ncies	3	_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1010/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1052/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1236/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	741/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	1353/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1104/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	890/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	119/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	900/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	1		1290/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	905/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	1		1268/1416		3.56	4.26	4.27	3.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75			3.52	3.97	4.02	
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1149/1312		3.33	4.00	4.09	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1195/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1239/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	2.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	71/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	83/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	82/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance		0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1 1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	106/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
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	1
				P	0			responses to	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	Λ						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor:

WHALEN, DALE LN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 10

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 258 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

a	~	- 1 . '	
Student	('Ollrse	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

				_	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1302/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	6	0	3.44	1331/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1143/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1168/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	2	1	3.00	1305/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1040/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	1	1	3.00	1387/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1233/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1165/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1169/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1154/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	896/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	587/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	877/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	675/1303	3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	922/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	137/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	165/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	179/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	110/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.44
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	135/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.89

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				Ş	0						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor:

UKOLA, GOKUL (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 10

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 259 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student.	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1302/1504	3.79	3.80	4.27	4.27	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	6	0		1331/1503	3.73	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1143/1290	3.52	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1168/1453	3.90	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	2	1	3.00	1305/1421	3.06	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1040/1365	3.70	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	1	1	3.00	1387/1485	3.53	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	772/1483	3.80	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1238/1425	4.08	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1300/1426	4.28	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1232/1418	3.90	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1029/1416	3.66	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	780/1199	3.32	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	877/1312	3.53	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40		3.60	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	922/1299	3.44	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	4.13	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	137/ 233	4.03	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	165/ 244	4.11	4.05	4.09	4.20	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	179/ 227	4.48	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	110/ 225	4.18	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.44
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	135/ 207	3.79	3.84	4.09		3.89

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

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK

Title

Enrollment: 172 Questionnaires: 122

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 260 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	3	3	18	36	60	4.22	927/1504	4.36	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	6	22	40	50	4.11	990/1503	4.29	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	5	15	48	48	4.12	887/1290	4.29	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	67	1	1	9	24	17	4.06	974/1453	4.22	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	14	1	6	9	19	69	4.43	383/1421	4.50	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	65	2	5	8	17	20	3.92	878/1365	4.29	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	3	3	13	20	30	49		1047/1485	4.22	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	0		112	4.97	263/1504	4.98	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	3	2	3	10	48	41	4.18	710/1483	4.32	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	7	35	73	4.53	760/1425	4.72	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	12	103	4.84	667/1426	4.91	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	4	30	38	43	4.02	1009/1418	4.33	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	5	27	25	56	4.06	1011/1416	4.28	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	29	5	4	18	29	30	3.87	762/1199	4.12	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	100	0	0	0	3	10	9	4.27	****/1312	****	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	101	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	****/1303	****	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	102	0	0	0	3	4	13		****/1299	****	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	101	1	1	0	1	4	14	4.50	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
T abassahassa														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	118	0	0	0	1	Λ	2	4 50	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	1	2	<i>3</i>		****/ 244	***	4.05	4.09	4.12	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	118	0	0	1	0	2	1		****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	118	0	0	1	0	3	U		****/ 225	***	3.95	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	118	0	0	0	1	2	1		****/ 207	***	3.84	4.09	4.14	***
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	110	U	U	U	1			4.00	/ 207		3.04	4.09	4.14	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	121	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	121	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	121	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	121	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****

Credits E	dits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	29	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	37						
56-83	41	2.00-2.99	16	C	34	General	0	Under-grad	122	Non-major	114
84-150	33	3.00-3.49	30	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	31	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	ſh
				P	0			responses t	gnificant		

I 0 Other 111 ? 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2005

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH

Enrollment: 182 Questionnaires: 89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 261

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Onnove 1														
General  1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	0	6	23	55	4.50	549/1504	4.36	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	6	30	49	4.47	556/1503	4.29	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	8	24	52	4.45	574/1290	4.29	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	42	2	1	2	12	27	4.39	618/1453	4.22	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	1	0	8	15	57	4.57	276/1421	4.50	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	60	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	187/1365	4.29	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	0	10	19	55	4.49	468/1485	4.22	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	85	5.00	1/1504	4.98	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	2	0	5	19	42	4.46	397/1483	4.32	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.46
Lecture	_	0	_	0	-1	_		4 00	161/1405	4 50	2 0 4	4 41	4 42	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	5	77	4.92	- ,	4.72	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	82	4.99	101/1426	4.91	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	3	20	59	4.64	414/1418	4.33	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1 2	2	8 8	16	56	4.49	636/1416	4.28	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	25	2	1	8	7	35	4.36	412/1199	4.12	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	69	0	4	1	4	2	9	3.55	****/1312	****	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	68	0	1	0	4	5	11	4.19	****/1303	****	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	68	0	1	0	5	3	12	4.19	****/1299	****	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	68	15	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory	0.5	-		•		•	_	- 00			2 26	4 00	4 10	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	85	1	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	85	0	0	0	1	0	3		,	****	4.05	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	85	0	0	0	1 1	0	3 2		****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	85		0	0	1	1	_		****/ 225		3.95	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	85	0	U	U	Τ	1	2	4.25	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	4.14	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	86	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	86	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	86	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	86	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	86	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	86	0	1	0	0	0	2.		****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	86	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	86	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	86	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 39	***	***	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced						_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	86	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	86	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	86	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	86	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY II

Instructor:

HOSMANE, RAMACH

Enrollment: 182
Questionnaires: 89

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 261 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	19	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	В	25						
56-83	18	2.00-2.99	7	C	18	General	0	Under-grad	89	Non-major	88
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	22	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	2			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	62				
				?	4						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 9

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 262 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
a1														
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	927/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	312/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	•	4.56	459/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	0	3		1001/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	1	3		1113/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	493/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	536/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	338/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425		3.94	4.41	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	0		4.14	947/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1			1029/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	542/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	53/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	82/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	46/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	46/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	***	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 67	***	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	***	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	***	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	***	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	***	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 262 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

ctor: BAKKI, BRAIN (Instr. B)

Instructor: BAKKI

Baltimore County Spring 2005 Page 263 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 9

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fr	Frequencies				Tngi	tructor	Course	ourse Dept		Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	927/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	312/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	459/1290		3.59	4.28	4.31	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	1001/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1113/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne		2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	493/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	536/1485		3.60	4.16	4.17	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	543/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	3 75	1257/1425	4 21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426		4.11	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	0	2		1250/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	1	0	_	4.33	806/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		3	0	0	0	0	1		****/1199		3.52	3.97		4.20
J. Did addiovisaal teelmiques elmanee your understanding	3	5	U	U	U	O	_	3.00	/ 1100	3.70	3.32	3.71	4.02	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	. 6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory	2	0	0	0	0	-	_	4 02	00/022	4 4 4	2 06	4 00	4 10	4 02
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	2		4.67	53/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0 0	0	0	1	0		4.67	82/ 227		4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0		0	0	1		4.83	46/ 225		3.95	4.23	4.29	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	46/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	***	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	. 8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	***	****	4.35	4.24	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	***	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	***	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	***	****	4.23	4.13	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	***	***	4.65	4.13	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	***	****	4.29	4.77	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.14	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	, 39			1.11	1.1/	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	***	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor: BAKKI, BRAIN

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 263 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

352L 0103 University of Maryland

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 264
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	14

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

guestionnaires. 11 Seadene course Evaluation guestionnaire																	
					Frequencies				Tngi	tructor	•	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect	
	Ouestions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran			_		Mean	
	General																
	insights, skills from		0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	1061/1	504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.07
2. Did the instructo	or make clear the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	954/1	.503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.14
3. Did the exam ques	stions reflect the ex	xpected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	937/1	290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluat	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	821/1	453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.21		
5. Did assigned read	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	579/1	421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.21		
6. Did written assig	gnments contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	472/1	.365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.36
7. Was the grading s	system clearly expla	ined	0	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1257/1	.485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.57
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	854/1	.504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.79
9. How would you gra	ade the overall teach	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	850/1	.483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.90
1	Lecture	1	-	0	0	0	0	_	1.0	4 88	400/1	405	4 01	2 0 4	4 41	4 42	4 50
	cor's lectures well p	=	1	0	0	0	0	3		4.77	- ,			3.94			4.52
2. Did the instructo			1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85			4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture mater			1	0	0	0	1	5	7		630/1		4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.28
4. Did the lectures			1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69						4.27	
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance yo	our understanding	1	3	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	213/1	.199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.90
1. Did class discuss	Discussion	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1 / 1	312	4.31	3 33	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students			10	0	0	0	1	1			796/1					4.27	
3. Did the instructor			10	0	1	0	1	0			1106/1					4.30	
3. Dia one inscruce	or encourage rair and	a open discussion	10	Ü	_	Ü	-	Ŭ	-	3.30	1100/1		3.75	3.13	1.25	1.30	3.30
	Laboratory																
1. Did the lab incre	ease understanding of	f the material	2	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	129/	233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.17
2. Were you provided	d with adequate backs	ground information	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	67/	244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.58
3. Were necessary ma			2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	82/	227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instr	ructor provide assis	tance	2	0	2	0	0	2	8	4.17	146/	225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.17
5. Were requirements	s for lab reports cle	early specified	2	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	103/	207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.08
	ni ala mania																
1 54 64 14	Field Work		1 2	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	++++/	го	****	2 22	4 42	4 50	****
1. Did field experie			13	0	0	0	0	-	1		****/ ****/	58 56	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly u			13 13	0	0	0	0	0	1		,		****	****		4.13	****
3. was the instructo	or available for con	sultation	13	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/	44	^ ^ ^ ^	^ ^ ^ ^	4.65	4.77	
	Self Paced																
1. Did self-paced sy	stem contribute to	what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	40	****	****	4.53	4.74	***
		Frequ	encv	Digt	rih	ıtior	n										
		11040	стоу	2100		.0101	-										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Тур	pe			Majors	1

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 13

I

?

Ouestionnaires: 14

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

(Instr. B) Spring 2005

Instructor: RIVERA, LIZ Enrollment: 16

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 265

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 6 4.07 1061/1504 4.30 3.80 4.27 4.27 4.07 0 0 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 6 4.14 954/1503 4.26 3.60 4.20 4.22 4.14 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 5 4.00 937/1290 4.15 3.59 4.28 4.31 4.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Ω Ω 0 6 4.21 821/1453 4.08 3.76 4.21 4.23 4.21 Ω 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 7 4.21 579/1421 4.02 3.67 4.00 4.01 4.21 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 8 4.36 472/1365 4.17 3.75 4.08 4.08 4.36 7. Was the grading system clearly explained Ω Ω 1 1 3 3.57 1257/1485 3.77 3.60 4.16 4.17 3.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 3 11 4.79 854/1504 4.93 4.84 4.69 4.65 4.79 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 4 3.80 1093/1483 4.00 3.64 4.06 4.08 3.90 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 1 1 3 6 4.27 1022/1425 4.21 3.94 4.41 4.43 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 1 7 4.40 1197/1426 4.52 4.11 4.69 4.71 4.62 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 Ω 1 3 5 4.10 981/1418 4.09 3.68 4.25 4.26 4.28 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 2 5 3.73 1180/1416 3.98 3.56 4.26 4.27 4.21 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 6 1 0 1 1 3.20 1018/1199 3.76 3.52 3.97 4.02 3.90 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 4 5.00 1/1312 4.31 3.33 4.00 4.09 5.00 10 Ω 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 796/1303 3.67 3.14 4.24 4.27 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 2 3.50 1106/1299 3.93 3.13 4.25 4.30 3.50 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 0 5 4.17 129/233 4.44 3.96 4.09 4.12 4.17 0 1 1 5 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 7 4.58 67/ 244 4.53 4.05 4.09 4.20 4.58 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 0 9 4.67 82/ 227 4.41 4.16 4.40 4.46 4.67 8 4.17 146/ 225 4.48 3.95 4.23 4.29 4.17 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified Ω 7 4.08 103/ 207 4.30 3.84 4.09 4.14 4.08 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 3.33 4.43 4.52 0 58 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5.00 ****/ 56 **** **** 4.23 4.13 13 0 0 44 **** **** 4.65 4.77 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 1 5.00 ****/ 13 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** / 40 **** **** 4.53 4.74 **** Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA				Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5							
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14	
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 13

I

?

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A) University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 266 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions				_	ncies				ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	609/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	678/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	4	5	3.77	1075/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	680/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	633/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	581/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1253/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	525/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	810/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	842/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	643/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	243/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	901/1199		3.52	3.97		3.56
Discussion	_	_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	221/1312		3.33	4.00	4.09	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	851/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	445/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	71/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	67/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	158/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	113/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.42
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	88/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.25
Frequ	encv	Digt	-rihı	ıtioı	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				2	1						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title SANKARA, NARESH (Instr. B) Instructor:

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 267 Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
a 1														
General	0	0	_	0	0		_	4 46	600/1504	4 20	2 00	4 00	4 00	4 46
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	/	6	4.46	609/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	678/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	4	5		1075/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	680/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	633/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	581/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	1	2	5	3.58	1253/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	525/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	657/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	876/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	4		1073/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	682/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	845/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	1	0	0	1	1		****/1199			3.97	4.02	3.56
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	O	4		U	U			3.33	/1199	3.70	3.32	3.31	4.02	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	221/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	851/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	445/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.50	71/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.50
<u> </u>	1	0	0	0		4	7		,				4.12	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1				0	5	7	4.58	67/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09		4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	3	1	4.33	158/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	113/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.42
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	88/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.25

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_		_	
				?	1						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor:

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 268 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	<b>1</b>			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	750/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	827/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	681/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	440/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1222/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	708/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	990/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	850/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.15
Lecture		0	^	0	-	_	_	4 6 4	610/1405	4 01	2 0 4	4 41	4 42	4 60
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	618/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	Τ	0	0	0	Ţ	2	-7		1050/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	913/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	688/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	810/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	1240/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	1		1053/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.75
-														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	102/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	97/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	138/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance		0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	97/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	79/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.33

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

Title

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

SANKARA, NARESH (Instr. B)

Instructor: Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 269 Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

				Inst	structor Course I		Dept UMBC Level		Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1														
General	0	0	0	0	_	2	_	1 26	750/1504	4 20	2 00	4 07	4 07	1 26
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	750/1504		3.80	4.27	4.27	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	827/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	∠ 1	3	6	4.36	681/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	Ţ	2	5	4.50	440/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	Τ	2	2	3		1222/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	Τ	4	4.13	708/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	990/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	580/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		0	0	Λ	Ο	2	1	4.57	700/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	-	4.71	895/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	818/1418	4.09	3.68	4.09	4.71	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	961/1416	3.98	3.56	4.25	4.27	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4 4	3	1	0	1		2	3.50	919/1199	3.76	3.50	3.97	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	Т	U	Т	U	2	3.50	919/1199	3.70	3.54	3.97	4.02	3.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	1240/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1053/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	102/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	97/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	138/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	97/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	79/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.33

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

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 11

Title

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 270 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

Questions		NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
~														
General			_	_		_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	826/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.30
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	1 1	0 0	0	0	1	5 5	4	4.30	795/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	5 4	3 4	$4.10 \\ 4.11$	894/1290 935/1453	4.15 4.08	3.59 3.76	4.28 4.21	4.31 4.23	$4.10 \\ 4.11$
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	283/1421	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	525/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	2		1284/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	409/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	665/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	502/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	656/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	574/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	471/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	776/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	154/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	63/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	34/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	82/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	58/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	33/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.78
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	***	****	4.29	4.14	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 40	****	****	4 E2	1 71	***
<ol> <li>Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did study questions make clear the expected goal</li> </ol>	10 10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40 ****/ 35	****	****	4.53 4.49	4.74 4.36	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your concacts with the instructor helpful	ΤU	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 36	,		4.00	4.03	• ••

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enougi	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

RIVERA, LIZ (Instr. B) Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 271 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 11

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

				_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	826/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	795/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	894/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	935/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	283/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	525/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1284/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504		4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	493/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1165/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	790/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	317/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	727/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	860/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	776/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	154/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	63/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	34/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	82/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	58/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	33/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.78
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	***	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	***	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	***	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	***	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.44	4.47	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	***	4.60	4.63	***

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enougi	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

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

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 17 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 272 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	594/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	633/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	671/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	501/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	712/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	346/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	6	3	6	3.88	1104/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	1041/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	793/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	4	11	4.35	951/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	549/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	7	9	4.35	754/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	837/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	636/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	3	1	1		1195/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	2	1	2		1184/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	1	0	1	1		****/ 758		3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	66/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	64/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.12	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1		11	4.67	82/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	67/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	64/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.23		4.47
5. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	۷	U	U	U	۷	4	9	4.4/	04/ 207	4.30	3.04	4.09	4.14	4.4/
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		,	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	***	4.17	4.25	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	***

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment: 18 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 272 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Page 273
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MOTEL, BILLY (Instr. B)
Enrollment: 18

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	594/1504	4 30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	633/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	671/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	501/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	712/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	346/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	6	3	6	3.88	1104/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	1041/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	710/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1165/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	1217/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	828/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	1	4		1145/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	987/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	716/1312		3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	3	1	1		1195/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	2	1	2		1184/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	66/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	64/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	82/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	67/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	64/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	***	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 70	****	***	4.35	4.24	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	***	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	,	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	***	****	4.53	4.74	***

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	***	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Questionnaires: 17

Title

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: MOTEL, BILLY

(Instr. B)

Page 273 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor:

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Spring 2005

Page 274 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	18
Ouestionnaires:	16

Title

~	~			
Student	('011702	Evaluation	()IIAGEI ONY	12172
bladciil	COULBC	Evaluation	Oucscion	Iall

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	5	4 00	1092/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	6		1052/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	758/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	5	5	4		1200/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	9	4	4.00	745/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	782/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	4	5	3.56	1261/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	635/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	7	7	4.33	971/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.04
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	860/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	838/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	6	7	4.13	969/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	603/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1240/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	2.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1227/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	165/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.87
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	107/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	158/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	141/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.21
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	93/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.20

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: ZHUI, VIC

Baltimore County Spring 2005 (Instr. B)

I

0

Page 275 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		Question	.s		NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	5	4.00	1092/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.00
		tor make clear			0	0	1	0	3	6	6		1052/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.00
		estions reflec			0	2	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	758/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.29
		ations reflect			0	1	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	1200/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.73
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	9	4	4.00	745/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	782/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was th	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	2	1	4	4	5	3.56	1261/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.56
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	.ll teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	1	0	6	4	0	3.18	1346/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.72
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture			4	0	0	2	3	3	4		1257/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.04
		tor seem inter		4	0	1	0	5	4	2		1381/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.12	
			explained clearly	5	0	3	0	4	3	1		1354/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.59	
		s contribute t		6	0	4	3	0	2	1		1394/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.22	
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	our understanding	6	7	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.09	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
				d to participate	11	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1240/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	2.60
				d open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1227/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	2.80
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		11	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	***
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	e lab inc	rease understa	nding c	of the material	1	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	165/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	3.87
				ground information	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	107/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.40
				or lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	158/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.33
		tructor provid			1	1	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	141/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.21
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	93/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.20
				Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	oe			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduate	9	0	Majo	or	1
28-55 56-83	0	1.00-1.99	0 1	B 10 C 1		Cos	nera	1				0	IIndor ~	rad 1	6	Non	madom	15
84-150	1 12	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	4	D 0		Gei	iera.	T				U	Under-g	Lau I	.6	non-	-major	TD
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	D 0 F 0		, וים	ectiv	70C				0	#### - 1	Meana +	here :	re not	enous	·h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	U	F 0		ъ.т.	=C L I \	ves				U	response				_	11
				P U									response	es co E	e sign	ıııcar	IL	

Other

16

University of Maryland Baltimore County

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Page 276
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Spring 2005

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 14

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1061/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	722/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	937/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	957/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	997/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	603/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	878/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	700/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	784/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1065/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	848/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	806/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	840/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1139/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	113/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	95/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	115/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	86/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	56/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.55
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	***	****	4.61	4.84	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	***	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	***	****	4.44	4.51	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	***	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor:

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

18

Page 276 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
Instructor: ZHUI, VIC (Instr. B)

Instructor: ZHUI
Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 14

B) Spring 2005

Page 277 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires. 14 Student Cou	ILDE	ьvат	uati	OII Q	uest.	LOIIII	атте	•						
			П			_		T 4		G	Damb	TIMDO	T 1	0
Quartiena	MID	NA	rr	_	ncies 3	3 4	_	Mean	ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions		IVA						меан	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	4	4 07	1061/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	722/1503		3.60	4.20	4.22	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	937/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	3		4.08	957/1453		3.76	4.21	4.23	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	3	_	3.69	997/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	7		603/1365		3.75	4.08	4.08	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	878/1485		3.60	4.16	4.17	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504		4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	850/1483		3.64	4.06	4.08	4.10
J														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1223/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1050/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1013/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	994/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	716/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	1	0	2		1139/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0		4.50	570/1299			4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
T -1														
Laboratory	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.27	112/ 222	1 11	2 06	4 00	4.12	4 27
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3 2	2 2	6 7		113/ 233 95/ 244	4.44 4.53	3.96 4.05	4.09	4.12	4.27
	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.45			4.16	4.09	4.46	4.45 4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	86/ 225	4.41	3.95	4.40	4.40	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	56/ 207		3.84	4.09	4.14	4.55
5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	3	U	U	U	۷	Т	0	4.55	56/ 207	4.30	3.04	4.09	4.14	4.55
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
3 3														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														

1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** 4.53 4.74 ****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Title

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: ZHUI, VIC (Ir

Enrollment: 18

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 277 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 278 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 16

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	337/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	692/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	561/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	924/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	548/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	748/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1104/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	751/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	665/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	351/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	630/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	675/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	872/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	Ο	2	1 33	****/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	35/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.77
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	62/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.62
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	118/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	99/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	64/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.46

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				?	0						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor:

MOTEL, BILLY (Instr. B) University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 279 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equer		s			tructor	Course	_	-	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	337/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	692/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	561/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	924/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	548/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	748/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1104/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	741/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1082/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1008/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	828/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1099/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	129/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	35/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.77
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	62/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.62
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	118/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	99/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	64/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	4.46
J. Here requirements for tab reports creatry specified	J	U		U	_	_	10	1.10	04/ 207	4.50	3.04	1.09	1.11	1.10

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-		_	
				2	0						

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor:

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 11

Title

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 280 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

~	~		
Student	('0117'04)	k'tra liiati on	Ouestionnaire
Deddelle	COULBC	Evaluation	Oucacionnatic

		Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	624/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.45
1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	910/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.20
0	1	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1062/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.80
0	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1001/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.00
0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	685/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.09
0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	654/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.18
0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	943/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.09
0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	657/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.91
2	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1009/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.67
3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1036/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.88
3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1128/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.08
3	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1163/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.88
3	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1112/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	3.44
3	3	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1018/1199	3.76	3.52	3.97	4.02	3.20
4	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	922/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	3.71
5	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1182/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.17
5	0	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1194/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	3.00
5	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	4.00
3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	36/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.75
3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	83/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.50
3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	151/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.38
3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	88/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.63
3	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	149/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.75
	0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1  0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 1 5 0 2 5 0 1 5 3 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0 3 0 0	NR NA 1 2  0 0 0 0 0  1 0 0 0  0 1 0 0  0 0 1 0  0 0 0 0  0 0 0 0  0 0 0 0  0 0 0 0  2 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 1  3 0 0 1  3 3 1 0  4 0 1 0  5 0 2 0  5 0 1 2  5 3 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0  3 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3  0 0 0 0 0 2  1 0 0 0 2  1 0 0 0 5  0 0 1 0 1  0 0 0 0 3  0 0 0 0 3  0 0 0 0 2  0 0 0 0 3  0 0 0 0 2  0 0 0 0 3  0 0 0 0 3  0 0 0 1 3  3 0 0 0 1  3 0 0 1 2  3 0 0 1 2  3 0 0 1 2  3 0 1 2  15 0 1 2 1  5 0 1 2 1  5 0 1 2 1  5 3 0 0 1  3 0 0 0 1  3 0 0 0 1  3 0 0 0 1  3 0 0 0 1  3 0 0 0 1  3 0 0 0 1  3 0 0 0 1  3 0 0 0 1  3 0 0 0 1  3 0 0 0 1  3 0 0 0 1  3 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0 0 2 2 1 0 0 0 5 2 0 0 1 0 1 5 0 0 0 0 3 4 0 0 0 0 0 3 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 1 2 3 0 0 1 2 3 3 0 0 1 2 3 3 0 0 1 2 2 3 3 1 0 2 1 4 0 1 0 1 3 5 0 2 0 1 1 5 0 1 2 1 0 5 3 0 0 0 1 2 3 0 0 0 1 2 3 3 0 0 1 1	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5  0 0 0 0 0 2 2 7  1 0 0 0 5 2 3  0 0 1 0 1 5 4  0 0 0 0 3 4 4  0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4  0 0 0 0 0 3 3 5  0 0 0 0 0 2 6 3  0 0 0 0 0 1 10  2 0 0 0 1 2 3 2  3 0 0 1 2 3 2  3 0 0 1 2 3 2  3 0 0 1 2 3 2  3 0 0 1 2 3 2  3 0 0 1 2 1 1  4 0 1 0 1 3 2  5 0 2 0 1 1 2  5 0 1 2 1 0 2  5 0 1 2 1 0 2  5 3 0 0 1 2 1 0  2 5 3 0 0 1 1 1  3 0 0 0 0 1 2 5  3 0 0 1 1 1 1  3 0 0 0 0 1 2 5  3 0 0 1 1 1 1	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean  0 0 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 1 0 0 0 5 2 3 3.80 0 1 0 1 5 4 4.00 0 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 0 0 0 0 3 3 5 4.18 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 3 4.09 0 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 2 0 0 0 1 2 3 23.75 3 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 3 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 3 0 0 1 2 3 3.88 3 3 1 0 2 1 1 3.20  4 0 1 0 1 3 2 3.71 5 0 2 0 1 1 2 3.17 5 0 1 2 1 0 2 3.00 5 3 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 3 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 3 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 3 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank  0 0 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 624/1504 1 0 0 0 5 2 3 3.80 1062/1290 0 1 0 1 5 4 4.00 1001/1453 0 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 685/1421 0 0 0 0 3 3 5 4.18 654/1365 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 3 4.09 943/1485 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 2 3.89 1009/1483  3 0 0 0 1 2 3 23.75 1163/1418 3 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 3 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 3 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 3 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 3 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 3 0 0 1 2 2 3 3.88 1112/1416 3 3 1 0 2 1 1 3.20 1018/1199  4 0 1 0 1 3 2 3.77 1922/1312 5 0 2 0 1 1 2 3.17 1182/1303 5 0 1 2 1 0 2 3.00 1194/1299 5 3 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 83/ 244 3 0 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 151/ 227 3 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 88/ 225	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean  0 0 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 624/1504 4.30 1 0 0 0 2 4 4 4.20 910/1503 4.26 0 1 0 0 5 2 3 3.80 1062/1290 4.15 0 0 1 0 1 5 4 4.00 1001/1453 4.08 0 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 685/1421 4.02 0 0 0 0 3 3 5 4.18 654/1365 4.17 0 0 0 0 2 6 3 4.09 943/1485 3.77 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 3 4.09 943/1485 3.77 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 2 3.89 1009/1483 4.00  3 0 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 4.09 3 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 4.09 3 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 4.09 3 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 4.09 3 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 4.09 3 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 4.09 3 0 0 1 2 3 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 4.09 3 0 0 1 2 3 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 4.09 3 0 0 1 2 3 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 4.09 3 0 0 1 2 3 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 4.09 3 0 0 1 2 3 3.00 1194/1299 3.93 5 0 1 2 1 0 2 3.00 1194/1299 3.93 5 3 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 387/758 4.20  3 0 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 36/233 4.44 3 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 83/244 4.53 3 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 151/227 4.41 3 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 4.38 151/227 4.41 3 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 88/225 4.48	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean  0 0 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 624/1504 4.30 3.80 1 0 0 0 0 2 4 4 4.20 910/1503 4.26 3.60 0 1 0 0 5 2 3 3.80 1062/1290 4.15 3.59 0 0 1 0 1 5 4 4.00 1001/1453 4.08 3.76 0 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 685/1421 4.02 3.67 0 0 0 0 3 3 5 4.18 654/1365 4.17 3.75 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 3 4.09 943/1485 3.77 3.60 0 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 657/1504 4.93 4.84 2 0 0 0 3 4 2 3.89 1009/1483 4.00 3.64  3 0 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 4.09 3.68 3 0 0 1 2 2 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 4.09 3.68 3 0 0 1 2 2 3 3 3.88 1112/1416 3.98 3.56 3 3 1 0 2 1 1 3.20 1018/1199 3.76 3.52  4 0 1 0 1 3 2 3.71 922/1312 4.31 3.33 5 0 2 0 1 1 2 3.00 1194/1299 3.93 3.13 5 3 0 0 1 2 1 0 2 3.00 1194/1299 3.93 3.13 5 3 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 83/244 4.53 4.05 3 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 83/244 4.53 4.05 3 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 151/227 4.41 4.16 3 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 4.38 151/227 4.41 4.16	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean  0 0 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 624/1504 4.30 3.80 4.27 1 0 0 0 0 2 4 4 4 4.20 910/1503 4.26 3.60 4.20 0 1 0 0 5 2 3 3.80 1062/1290 4.15 3.59 4.28 0 0 1 0 1 5 4 4.00 1001/1453 4.08 3.76 4.21 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 685/1421 4.02 3.67 4.00 0 0 0 0 3 3 5 4.18 654/1365 4.17 3.75 4.08 0 0 0 0 0 2 6 3 4.09 943/1485 3.77 3.60 4.16 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 657/1504 4.93 4.84 4.69 2 0 0 0 3 4 2 3.89 1009/1483 4.00 3.64 4.06  3 0 0 0 1 2 3 3.89 1009/1483 4.00 3.64 4.06  3 0 0 0 1 2 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 4.09 3.68 4.25 3 0 0 1 2 2 3 2.89 1009/1483 4.00 3.64 4.06  4 0 1 0 1 3 2 3.71 922/1312 4.31 3.33 4.00 5 0 2 0 1 1 2 3.17 1182/1303 3.67 3.14 4.24 5 0 1 2 1 0 2 3.00 1194/1299 3.93 3.13 4.25 5 3 0 0 1 1 2 1 0 2 3.00 1194/1299 3.93 3.13 4.25 5 3 0 0 1 1 1 1 4.00 387/758 4.20 3.71 4.01  3 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 83/244 4.53 4.05 4.09 3 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 83/244 4.53 4.05 4.09 3 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 83/244 4.53 4.05 4.09 3 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 83/244 4.53 4.05 4.09 3 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 151/227 4.41 4.16 4.40 3 0 0 0 1 1 3 6 4.63 88/225 4.48 3.95 4.23	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean  0 0 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 624/1504 4.30 3.80 4.27 4.27  1 0 0 0 0 2 4 4 4.20 910/1503 4.26 3.60 4.20 4.22  0 1 0 0 5 2 3 3.80 1062/1290 4.15 3.59 4.28 4.31  0 0 1 0 1 5 4 4.00 1001/1453 4.08 3.76 4.21 4.23  0 0 0 0 3 4 4 4.09 685/1421 4.02 3.67 4.00 4.01  0 0 0 0 3 3 5 4.18 654/1365 4.17 3.75 4.08 4.08  0 0 0 0 0 2 6 3 4.09 943/1485 3.77 3.60 4.16 4.17  0 0 0 0 0 3 4 2 3.89 1009/1483 4.00 3.64 4.06 4.08  3 0 0 0 1 2 3 3.89 1009/1483 4.00 3.64 4.06 4.08  3 0 0 0 1 2 3 3 2 3.75 1163/1418 4.09 3.68 4.25 4.26  3 0 0 1 2 2 3 3.88 1112/1416 3.98 3.56 4.26 4.27  3 3 1 0 2 1 1 3.20 1018/1199 3.76 3.52 3.97 4.02  4 0 1 0 1 3 2 3.71 922/1312 4.31 3.33 4.00 4.09  5 0 2 0 1 1 2 3.17 1182/1303 3.67 3.14 4.24 4.27  5 0 1 2 1 0 2 3.00 1194/1299 3.93 3.13 4.25 4.30  5 3 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 4.50 83/244 4.53 4.05 4.09 4.12  3 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 5 4.50 83/244 4.53 4.05 4.09 4.20  3 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 5 4.50 83/244 4.53 4.05 4.09 4.20  3 0 0 0 1 1 2 5 4.50 83/244 4.53 4.05 4.09 4.20  3 0 0 0 1 1 2 5 4.50 83/244 4.53 4.05 4.09 4.20  3 0 0 0 1 1 3 4 4.38 151/ 227 4.41 4.16 4.40 4.46  3 0 0 0 1 1 1 6 4.63 88/225 4.48 3.95 4.23 4.29

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

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Title Instructor:

SADLER, JOSH (Instr. B) Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 281 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	624/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	910/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1062/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1001/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	685/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	654/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	943/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	657/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	5	0	3.44	1258/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1308/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	0	4	1		1373/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	1		1013/1418	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	2	0		1324/1416		3.56	4.26	4.27	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	1	0	0	0		****/1199		3.52		4.02	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	2	2 71	922/1312	4.31	2 22	4.00	4.09	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4 5	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.71	1182/1303	3.67	3.14	4.00	4.09	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5 5	0	1	2	1	0	2		1102/1303	3.93	3.14	4.24	4.27	3.17
4. Were special techniques successful	5 5	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.20	3.13	4.25		4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	U	U	Т	Т	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.20	3./1	4.01	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	36/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	83/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	151/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	88/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	149/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.75

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

CHEN SSZE CIE

Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 10

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 282 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Scaaciic	COULSE	ii vai ua ciioii	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	962/1504		3.80	4.27	4.27	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	3		1231/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1022/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1348/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	- ,	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1118/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	1	1		1419/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	173/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4 50	784/1425	4.21	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	5		1128/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	3.63
		0	0	0	1	2	5 5	4.50	578/1418	4.52	3.68			
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2 2	0	0	1	0	3	5 4	4.25				4.25	4.26 4.27	3.31 2.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	0	2	0	1		871/1416 1133/1199	3.98	3.56 3.52	4.26 3.97		2.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	۷	3	۷	U	2	U	1	2.60	1133/1199	3.76	3.54	3.97	4.02	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	592/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	798/1299		3.13	4.25	4.30	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 758		3.71	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	116/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	132/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	211/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	3.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	182/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	149/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.44	4.47	****
Colf Dogod														
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 40	***	****	4.53	4.74	****
1. Did sell-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	/ 40	•• ••		4.33	4./4	

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor:

PERKS, H MARK (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 282 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

CHANDRASEKHARAH (Instr. B) Instructor:

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 283 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

				Fre	eaner	ncies	:		Tnsi	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean		Mean
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	962/1504	4.30	3.80	4.27	4.27	4.20
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1231/1503	4.26	3.60	4.20	4.22	3.70
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1022/1290	4.15	3.59	4.28	4.31	3.90
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1348/1453	4.08	3.76	4.21	4.23	3.33
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	374/1421	4.02	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.44
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1118/1365	4.17	3.75	4.08	4.08	3.57
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	1	1		1419/1485	3.77	3.60	4.16	4.17	2.80
	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	4.93	4.84	4.69	4.65	5.00
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	0	2	0	0	1.67	1481/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.08	3.19
	Lecture														
1	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	3	1	1	1	2 50	1409/1425	4 21	3.94	4.41	4.43	3.50
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	3	2	1	1		1415/1426	4.52	4.11	4.69	4.71	3.63
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	1	1	0		1419/1428	4.09	3.68	4.25	4.26	3.31
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	1	0	-		1408/1416	3.98	3.56	4.26	4.27	2.98
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	2	0	0	0	-		****/1199		3.52	3.97	4.02	
٥.	bid additivisual techniques chilance your understanding	J	5	2	O	O	U	U	1.00	/ 11//	3.70	3.32	3.77	4.02	2.00
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	592/1312	4.31	3.33	4.00	4.09	4.25
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	796/1303	3.67	3.14	4.24	4.27	4.25
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	798/1299	3.93	3.13	4.25	4.30	4.25
	Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	4.20	3.71	4.01	4.00	****
	<u>.</u>														
_	Laboratory	_	_	_		_	_	_							
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	116/ 233	4.44	3.96	4.09	4.12	4.25
	Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	132/ 244	4.53	4.05	4.09	4.20	4.25
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	211/ 227	4.41	4.16	4.40	4.46	3.25
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	182/ 225	4.48	3.95	4.23	4.29	3.75
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	149/ 207	4.30	3.84	4.09	4.14	3.75
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	***
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	***
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	***	****	4.34	3.98	***
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	***	****	4.44	4.51	***
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	***	****	4.17	4.25	****
	Field Work														
1	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.52	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	3.33 ****	4.43	4.13	***
	Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.05	4.77	***
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
٥.	bid conferences help you carry out fred activities	פ	U	U	U	U	Т	U	<b>1.</b> 00	/ 39			7.77	T. T/	
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	***

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Title

ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB

Instructor: CHANDRASEKHARAH (Instr. B)

11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 283 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: CHEM 401 0101

CHEM 401 0101 University of Maryland CHEM/STAT THERMODYNAMI Baltimore County

Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY Spring

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 10

Title

Spring 2005

Page 284 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Quescionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Q1														
General		_	_	_			_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	788/1504		3.80	4.27	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1503	4.60	3.60	4.20	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	412/1290	4.60	3.59	4.28	4.32	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	440/1453	4.50	3.76	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	863/1421	3.90	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	100/1365	4.86	3.75	4.08	4.09	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	150/1485	4.80	3.60	4.16	4.14	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	137/1483	4.78	3.64	4.06	4.11	4.78
Lecture														
	0	0	_	0	0	_	_	4 85	400/1405	4 85	2 04	4 41	4 20	4 85
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	420/1425	4.75	3.94	4.41	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.11	4.69	4.72	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	736/1418	4.38	3.68	4.25	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1416	5.00	3.56	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	3.52	3.97	4.05	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	Λ	0	2	3	1	3.83	858/1312	3.83	3.33	4.00	4.07	3.83
-		0	0	0	1	2	2	4.33	737/1303		3.14	4.24	4.34	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	Τ	2	1		- ,					
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	U	U	U	2	3	Т	3.83	1025/1299	3.83	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.83

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

Course-Section: CHEM 410 0101
Title QUANTUM CHEMISTRY

Instructor: QUANTUM CHEMISTR

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 7

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 285 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	0	0	0	-1	0	4	4 42	660/1504	4 42	2 00	4 07	4 22	4 42
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	Τ.	2	4	4.43	669/1504	4.43	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	Ţ	3	3	0		1375/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	0		****/1290		3.59	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	1	2		1148/1453	3.83	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	1	2		1056/1421	3.60	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned			0	2	1	2	1		1225/1365	3.33	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained			0	2	0	1	0		1440/1485	2.67	3.60	4.16	4.14	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	1	3	2	4.17	731/1483	4.17	3.64	4.06	4.11	4.17
Lecture														
	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.17	1094/1425	4.17	3.94	4.41	4.38	4.17
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	-	0	0	Τ	3			,					
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.11	4.69	4.72	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	Ţ	4	Ţ		1013/1418	4.00	3.68	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	Τ	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	623/1416	4.50	3.56	4.26	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	987/1199	3.33	3.52	3.97	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	3.33	4.00	4.07	3.50
-		0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	563/1303	4.50	3.14	4.24	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	-	-	-	•	1	1		,					
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	Ţ	4.50	570/1299	4.50	3.13	4.25	4.38	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	U	U	Τ	U	Τ	U	3.00	680/ 758	3.00	3.71	4.01	4.17	3.00

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

BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Title Instructor: DA SILVA, VERA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 286 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	Frequencies		3		Tng	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1173/1504	3.96	3.80	4.27	4.33	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	6	2	3.43	1340/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	1116/1290	3.41	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	4	6	1	3.46	1302/1453		3.76	4.21	4.22	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	4	3	3.36	1198/1421	3.46	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	0	7	2	3.21	1259/1365	3.42	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	6	3		1200/1485		3.60	4.16	4.14	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0		4.79	854/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69		4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	4	7	0	3.23	1332/1483	3.54	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	5	3	5	3 79	1250/1425	3.69	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	6	6		1284/1426	3.91	4.11	4.69	4.72	3.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	4	3	2		1330/1418	3.55	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	4	5		1205/1416	3.43	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	2	3	2	_		946/1199		3.52	3.97		3.44	
5. Did dadiovibadi ecciniiques ciniance your anderseanding	5	3	O	_	5	_	2	3.11	J 10/ 11JJ	3.17	3.32	3.77	1.05	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	826/1312	3.40	3.33	4.00	4.07	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1089/1303	3.46	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	6	0	1	3.00	1194/1299	3.11	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****	
Laboratory		_	_	_	_	_									
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5		4.18	126/ 233	4.21	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	5	2		3.91	162/ 244		4.05	4.09	3.56	3.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	4	3	3		3.09	215/ 227		4.16	4.40	4.16	3.09	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	5		4.36	121/ 225		3.95	4.23		4.36	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	4	3	3	0	2.73	204/ 207	3.17	3.84	4.09	3.69	2.73	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	***	****	4.34	4.34	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	***	****	4.44	4.51	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	***	4.17	4.29	***	
ni al di wasala															
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	Ο	3.00	****/ 58	***	3.33	4.43	4.83	****	
<u>-</u>	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 58	****	3.33 ****	4.43		****	
<ol> <li>Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria</li> <li>Was the instructor available for consultation</li> </ol>	$\frac{14}{14}$	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.23	4.37 4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	$\frac{14}{14}$	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.65	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.12	****	
J. Did conferences help you carry out fred accrylities	T.4	U	U	Τ.	U	U	U	∠.00	/ 39			7.77	ユ・エク		
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****	

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful								2.00 ****/						
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful								2.00 ****/						
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	***

BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Title

Instructor: DA SILVA, VERA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 286 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	1						

CHEM 437L 0101 University of Maryland BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR Baltimore County

BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR Baltimore Coun BADHOU-PEAKER,P (Instr. B) Spring 2005

Enrollment: 15 Ouestionnaires: 15

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 287

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Ouestions 1 2 3 4 5 Mean NR NA Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 5 3.93 1173/1504 3.96 3.80 4.27 4.33 3.93 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 1 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 3.43 1340/1503 3.29 3.60 4.20 4.18 3.43 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 2 3.64 1116/1290 3.41 3.59 4.28 4.32 3.64 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 3.46 1302/1453 3.44 3.76 4.21 4.22 3.46 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 3.36 1198/1421 3.46 3.67 4.00 4.02 3.36 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 2 3.21 1259/1365 3.42 3.75 4.08 4.09 3.21 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 Ω 3 3.71 1200/1485 3.49 3.60 4.16 4.14 3.71 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 13 4.79 854/1504 4.83 4.84 4.69 4.73 4.79 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 3.55 1218/1483 3.54 3.64 4.06 4.11 3.55 Lecture 8 0 2 3 3.29 1340/1425 3.69 3.94 4.41 4.38 3.56 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 3 3.57 1378/1426 3.91 4.11 4.69 4.72 3.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 2 3.43 1275/1418 3.55 3.68 4.25 4.25 3.54 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 1 2 3.50 1248/1416 3.43 3.56 4.26 4.26 3.58 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12 2 0 3.00 ****/1199 3.17 3.52 3.97 4.05 3.44 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 6 2 3.89 826/1312 3.40 3.33 4.00 4.07 3.89 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 3.63 1089/1303 3.46 3.14 4.24 4.34 3.63 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 1 3.00 1194/1299 3.11 3.13 4.25 4.38 4. Were special techniques successful 0 3.33 ****/ 758 **** 3.71 4.01 4.17 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 0 4 4.18 126/ 233 4.21 3.96 4.09 3.78 4.18 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 3.91 162/ 244 4.16 4.05 4.09 3.56 3.91 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 1 3.09 215/ 227 2.94 4.16 4.40 4.16 3.09 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4 0 5 4.36 121/ 225 4.21 3.95 4.23 3.81 4.36 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0 2.73 204/207 3.17 3.84 4.09 3.69 2.73 4 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 14 0 0 0 3.00 ****/ 76 **** **** 4.61 4.63 70 **** 4.35 4.63 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3.00 ****/ 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3.00 ****/ 67 **** 4.34 4.34 **** 14 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 14 0 3.00 ****/ 76 4.44 4.51 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 14 3.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.17 4.29 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 3.00 ****/ 3.33 4.43 4.83 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 3.00 ****/ 56 * * * * 4.23 4.37 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 0 3.00 ****/ 44 4.65 4.33 **** 14 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 14 0 0 1 2.00 ****/ 47 * * * * * * * * 4.29 4.12 **** 0 2.00 ****/ 39 * * * * 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 14 0 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 40 **** **** 4.53 5.00 ****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful								2.00 ****/						
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful								2.00 ****/						
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	***

BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Title Instructor: BADHOU-PEAKER, P (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 287 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_		-	
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR Instructor: BLOCKLIN, A (Instr. C)

Spring 2005

Page 288 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	}		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	-	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1173/1504	3.96	3.80	4.27	4.33	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	6	2		1340/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	8	2		1116/1290	3.41	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	4	6	1		1302/1453		3.76	4.21	4.22	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	4			1198/1421	3.46	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	0	7	2	3.21	1259/1365	3.42	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	6			1200/1485	3.49	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	854/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1267/1483	3.54	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	3.69	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1426	3.91		4.69	4.72	3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1418	3.55	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1416	3.43	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	0	1	0	_		****/1199					3.44
Discussion														
	_	0	0	0	3	4	2	2 00	006/1210	2 40	2 22	4 00	4 07	2 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6 7	0	0	0	3 4	4	2 1	3.89	826/1312		3.33	4.00	4.07	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	-	0	4 6	_	_		1089/1303	3.46	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.63 3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	5	1	0	2	0 1			1194/1299 ****/ 758	3.11	3.13	4.25 4.01		3.UU ****
4. Were special techniques successful	/	5	U	U	۷	1	U	3.33	****/ /58		3./1	4.01	4.17	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	126/ 233	4.21	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	162/ 244	4.16	4.05	4.09	3.56	3.91
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	4	3	3	1	3.09	215/ 227	2.94	4.16	4.40	4.16	3.09
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	121/ 225	4.21	3.95	4.23	3.81	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	4	3	3	0	2.73	204/ 207	3.17	3.84	4.09	3.69	2.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	***	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	***

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful								2.00 ****/						
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful								2.00 ****/						
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	***

BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Instructor: BLOCKLIN, A (In

SLOCKLIN, A (Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 288 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 15

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

University of Maryland

BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Baltimore County Spring 2005 (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 289 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1173/1504	3.96	3.80	4.27	4.33	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	6	2		1340/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	8	2		1116/1290	3.41	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	4	6	1	3.46	1302/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	4	3	3.36	1198/1421	3.46	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	0	7	2	3.21	1259/1365	3.42	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1200/1485	3.49	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	854/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	850/1483	3.54	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1291/1425	3.69	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	2	1		1361/1426	3.91	4.11	4.69	4.72	3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	905/1418	3.55	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1216/1416	3.43	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	826/1312	3.40	3.33	4.00	4.07	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	4	3	1		1089/1303	3.46	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	6	0	1		1194/1299	3.11	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	126/ 233	4.21	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91		4.16	4.05	4.09	3.56	3.91
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	4	3	3	1	3.09	215/ 227	2.94	4.16	4.40	4.16	3.09
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	121/ 225	4.21	3.95	4.23	3.81	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	4	3	3	0	2.73	204/ 207	3.17	3.84	4.09	3.69	2.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	***

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Title

Instructor:

(Instr. D)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 289

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Title DA SILVA, VERA (Instr. A) Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 290 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	1092/1504	3.96	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	1	1	3.10	1407/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1231/1290	3.41	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	6	1	3.40	1333/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1056/1421	3.46	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1040/1365	3.42	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1359/1485	3.49	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1302/1483	3.54	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4 10	1129/1425	3.69	3 94	4.41	4.38	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2			1129/1425	3.91	4.11	4.69	4.72	3.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	3			1250/1418	3.55	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4			1268/1416	3.43	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	2	0	1	3		1100/1199	3.17	3.52	3.97	4.05	2.89
or bla addioribadi ocomitques emanes your andersounding	ŭ	_	J	_	ŭ	_	J	2.02	1100/1100	3.1.	3.32	J.,	1.00	2.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1209/1312	3.40	3.33	4.00	4.07	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1168/1303	3.46	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	1	1		1166/1299	3.11	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	116/ 233	4.21	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 244	4.16	4.05	4.09	3.56	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	226/ 227	2.94	4.16	4.40	4.16	2.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	153/ 225	4.21	3.95	4.23	3.81	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	149/ 207	3.17	3.84	4.09	3.69	3.75
Frequ	encv	Digt	rih	ıtioı	า									

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

BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

BADHOU-PEAKER,P (Instr. B)

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 291 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 10

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equer		5			ructor	Course	-	-	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	1092/1504	3.96	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	1	1	3.10	1407/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1231/1290	3.41	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	6	1	3.40	1333/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1056/1421	3.46	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1040/1365	3.42	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1359/1485	3.49	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1327/1483	3.54	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	Ο	Ο	2	5 00	****/1425	3.69	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	0	1	1		1373/1426	3.91	4.11	4.69	4.72	3.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1418	3.55	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1416	3.43	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.20
•														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1209/1312	3.40	3.33	4.00	4.07	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1168/1303	3.46	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1166/1299	3.11	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	116/ 233	4.21	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 244	4.16	4.05	4.09	3.56	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	226/ 227	2.94	4.16	4.40	4.16	2.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	153/ 225	4.21	3.95	4.23	3.81	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	149/ 207	3.17	3.84	4.09		3.75

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

BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR

Title Instructor: BLOCKLIN, A (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 292 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	1092/1504	3.96	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	1	1		1407/1503	3.29	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	1231/1290	3.41	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	6	1	3.40	1333/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1056/1421	3.46	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1040/1365	3.42	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1359/1485	3.49	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.83	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	850/1483	3.54	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1278/1425	3.69	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	0	3		1356/1426	3.91	4.11	4.69	4.72	3.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	3	1		1225/1418	3.55	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1324/1416	3.43	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1199	3.17	3.52	3.97	4.05	2.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	0	1	1	2 75	1209/1312	3.40	3.33	4.00	4.07	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	0	1	1		1168/1303	3.46	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	1	1		1166/1299	3.11	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
* - h														
Laboratory	_	0	0	_	-	-	_	4 05	116/022	4 01	2 06	4 00	2 50	4 05
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	Τ	Τ	2	4.25	116/ 233	4.21	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	83/ 244	4.16	4.05	4.09	3.56	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	226/ 227	2.94	4.16	4.40	4.16	2.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	153/ 225	4.21	3.95	4.23	3.81	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	Τ	3	U	3.75	149/ 207	3.17	3.84	4.09	3.69	3.75

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

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment: 111 Questionnaires: 56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 293 COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029 SZALAI, VERONIK (Instr. A) Spring 2005

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	9	18	28	4.29		4.29	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	14	25	11		1211/1503	3.75	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	5	18	22	8		1150/1290	3.53	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	42	1	3	4	3	3		1359/1453	3.29	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	7	15	14	13		1043/1421	3.62	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	39	2	0	7	5	2		1232/1365	3.31	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	4	11	9	28	4.06	964/1485	4.06	3.60	4.16	4.14	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	52	4.98	132/1504	4.98	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	23	21	4.25	635/1483	3.39	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	46	4.78	366/1425	3.87	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	5	47	4.80	738/1426	4.02	4.11	4.69	4.72	4.02
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	5	13	33	4.39	727/1418	3.49	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	5	2	13		4.35	799/1416	3.45	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	1	5	7	12		3.98	669/1199		3.52	3.97		3.64
									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	3	1	6	2	2	2.93	1178/1312	2.93	3.33	4.00	4.07	2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	1	3	5	2	3	3.21	1175/1303	3.21	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	1	1	5	5	2	3.43	1133/1299	3.43	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	43	8	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 244	****	4.05	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	3.69	****
Field Work		_	_	_	_	_								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	***
Colf Dogod														
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	EΛ	0	0	0	2	0	0	2 00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54 54	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.53		****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54 54	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 36	****	****	4.49	4.50 4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54 54	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54 54	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 16	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough procedrs for all the students	54	Τ	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	/ Тр			4.51		

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	'A	Expected	d Grade	es Reasons	Type		Major	S
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors 2	Graduate	2	Major	0

28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	24						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	54	Non-major	56
84-150	37	3.00-3.49	15	D	1						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there a	re not enough	n.
				P	0			responses to	be sign	ificant	
				I	0	Other	44				
				?	2						

DESIGNATIVE DIOCUEM

COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM

Instructor: KARPEL, RICHARD (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 111
Questionnaires: 56

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 294 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

				eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	9	18	28	4.29	851/1504	4.29	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	14	25	11	3.75	1211/1503	3.75	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	5	18	22	8	3.53	1150/1290	3.53	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	42	1	3	4	3	3	3.29	1359/1453	3.29	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	7	15	14	13	3.62	1043/1421	3.62	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	39	2	0	7	5	2		1232/1365	3.31	3.75	4.08	4.09	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	4	11	9	28	4.06	964/1485	4.06	3.60	4.16	4.14	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	52	4.98	132/1504	4.98	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	12	12	18	6	3	2.53	1446/1483	3.39	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	10	12	13	10	10	2.96	1374/1425	3.87	3.94	4.41	4.38	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	8	7	14	16	10	3.24	1400/1426	4.02	4.11	4.69	4.72	4.02
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	10	15	18	9	2	2.59	1388/1418	3.49	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	4	16	11	12	4	8	2.55	1374/1416	3.45	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	9	5	11	7	15	3.30	999/1199	3.64	3.52	3.97	4.05	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	3	1	6	2	2	2 02	1178/1312	2.93	3.33	4.00	4.07	2.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	1	3	5	2	3		1175/1312	3.21	3.14	4.24	4.34	3.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	1	1	5	5	2		1133/1299	3.43	3.14	4.25	4.38	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	43	8	1	2	0	1	1		****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
1. Were special deciminates successful	13	O	_	_	Ü	_	_	2.00	, , , 50		3.71	1.01	1.1,	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 233	***	3.96	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 244	***	4.05	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 227	****	4.16	4.40	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	3.84	4.09	3.69	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	***	****	4.29	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	2	0	Λ	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	0	0	1	1	n	3.50	****/ 35	***	****	4.49	4.50	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	54	1	0	0	1	0	n	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 16	****	****	4.51	****	****
J. Here there chagn proceeds for all the students	54	_	U	U	U	_	U	1.00	, 10			1.01		

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	'A	Expected	d Grade	es Reasons	Type		Major	S
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors 2	Graduate	2	Major	0

28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	24						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	54	Non-major	56
84-150	37	3.00-3.49	15	D	1						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there a	re not enough	n.
				P	0			responses to	be sign	ificant	
				I	0	Other	44				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 455 0101

Title INTRO BIOMEDICINAL CHE

Instructor: SELEY, KATHERIN

Enrollment: 69
Questionnaires: 47

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 295 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

3.77	1					ructor	000100	Dept	00	Level	Sect		
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	3	7	37	4 72	295/1504	4 72	3 80	4 27	4 33	4.72
0	0	0	0	1	11			,					4.72
0	-	•	•	0		0.0		-,					4.81
0	0	0	0	2	13	32		. ,		3.76			4.64
3	2	0	2	2	9			,					4.55
4	17	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	/	4.65	3.75	4.08	4.09	4.65
2	0	0	0	4	14	27	4.51	444/1485	4.51	3.60	4.16	4.14	4.51
3	0	0	0	0	31	13	4.30	1248/1504	4.30	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.30
14	0	0	0	3	9	21	4.55	306/1483	4.55	3.64	4.06	4.11	4.55
3	0	0	0	1	6	37		,					4.82
3	0	-	0	0	5			/					4.89
	-	-	•	_	5			. ,					4.75
3	0	0	1	0	7	36	4.77	/			4.26	4.26	4.77
4	2	1	0	4	9	27	4.49	290/1199	4.49	3.52	3.97	4.05	4.49
22	0	Λ	1	2	2	۵	1 26	E12/1212	1 26	2 22	4 00	4 07	4.36
	-	0	1	1	2	ر 11		- , -					4.50
			Τ	7	2								4.50
	4		1	2	1	9							4.50
32	4	U	Т	U	Т	9	4.04	****/ /58		3./1	4.01	4.1/	
46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.96	4.09	3.78	****
	3 3 3 4 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 2 0 2 2 4 4 17 0 0 2 2 0 0 0 4 3 0 0 0 0 3 8 14 0 0 0 3 8 3 0 0 1 3 0 0 0 3 3 0 0 1 0 4 2 1 0 4	0 0 0 0 0 3 7 0 0 0 0 0 1 11 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 0 0 0 0 2 13 3 2 0 2 2 9 4 4 17 0 0 2 5 2 0 0 0 4 14 3 0 0 0 0 3 9  3 0 0 0 1 6 3 0 0 0 3 5 3 0 0 0 3 5 3 0 0 1 0 7 4 2 1 0 4 9  33 0 0 1 2 2 31 0 0 1 1 3 33 0 0 0 2 3 32 4 0 1 0 1	0 0 0 0 0 3 7 37 0 0 0 0 0 1 11 35 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 38 0 0 0 0 0 2 13 32 3 2 0 2 2 9 29 4 4 17 0 0 2 5 19 2 0 0 0 4 14 27 3 0 0 0 0 31 13 5 14 0 0 0 3 9 21  3 0 0 0 1 6 37 3 0 0 0 0 3 5 36 3 0 0 1 0 7 36 4 2 1 0 4 9 27  33 0 0 1 2 2 9 31 0 0 1 1 3 11 33 0 0 0 2 3 9 32 4 0 1 0 1 9	0 0 0 0 0 3 7 37 4.72 0 0 0 0 0 1 11 35 4.72 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 38 4.81 0 0 0 0 2 13 32 4.64 3 2 0 2 2 9 29 4.55 4 17 0 0 2 5 19 4.65 2 0 0 0 4 14 27 4.51 3 0 0 0 0 31 13 4.30 8 14 0 0 0 3 9 21 4.55 3 0 0 0 0 3 9 21 4.55 3 0 0 0 0 5 39 4.89 3 0 0 0 0 3 5 36 4.75 3 0 0 1 0 7 36 4.77 4 2 1 0 4 9 27 4.49 33 0 0 1 2 2 9 4.36 31 0 0 1 1 3 11 4.50 33 0 0 0 2 3 9 4.50 33 0 0 0 2 3 9 4.50 33 0 0 1 0 1 9 4.64	0 0 0 0 3 7 37 4.72 295/1504 0 0 0 0 1 11 35 4.72 248/1503 0 0 0 0 0 9 38 4.81 201/1290 0 0 0 0 2 13 32 4.64 300/1453 3 2 0 2 2 9 29 4.55 290/1421 4 17 0 0 2 5 19 4.65 193/1365 2 0 0 0 4 14 27 4.51 444/1485 3 0 0 0 0 31 13 4.30 1248/1504 3 14 0 0 0 3 9 21 4.55 306/1483  3 0 0 0 1 6 37 4.82 315/1425 3 0 0 0 0 5 39 4.89 549/1426 3 0 0 0 3 5 36 4.75 261/1418 3 0 0 1 0 7 36 4.77 296/1416 4 2 1 0 4 9 27 4.49 290/1199  33 0 0 1 2 2 9 4.36 512/1312 31 0 0 1 1 3 11 4.50 563/1303 33 0 0 0 2 3 9 4.50 570/1299 32 4 0 1 0 1 9 4.64 ****/ 758	0 0 0 0 0 3 7 37 4.72 295/1504 4.72 0 0 0 0 0 1 11 35 4.72 248/1503 4.72 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 38 4.81 201/1290 4.81 0 0 0 0 0 2 13 32 4.64 300/1453 4.64 3 2 0 2 2 9 29 4.55 290/1421 4.55 4 17 0 0 2 5 19 4.65 193/1365 4.65 2 0 0 0 4 14 27 4.51 444/1485 4.51 3 0 0 0 0 31 13 4.30 1248/1504 4.30 8 14 0 0 0 3 9 21 4.55 306/1483 4.55  3 0 0 0 0 3 5 39 4.89 549/1426 4.89 3 0 0 0 0 3 5 39 4.89 549/1426 4.89 3 0 0 0 0 3 5 36 4.75 261/1418 4.75 3 0 0 1 0 7 36 4.77 296/1416 4.77 4 2 1 0 4 9 27 4.49 290/1199 4.49  33 0 0 1 2 2 9 4.36 512/1312 4.36 31 0 0 1 1 3 11 4.50 563/1303 4.50 33 0 0 0 2 3 9 4.50 570/1299 4.50 32 4 0 1 0 1 9 4.64 ****/ 758 ****	0 0 0 0 0 3 7 37 4.72 295/1504 4.72 3.80 0 0 0 0 0 1 11 35 4.72 248/1503 4.72 3.60 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 38 4.81 201/1290 4.81 3.59 0 0 0 0 0 2 13 32 4.64 300/1453 4.64 3.76 3 2 0 2 2 9 29 4.55 290/1421 4.55 3.67 4 17 0 0 2 5 19 4.65 193/1365 4.65 3.75 2 0 0 0 4 14 27 4.51 444/1485 4.51 3.60 3 0 0 0 0 31 13 4.30 1248/1504 4.30 4.84 3 14 0 0 0 3 9 21 4.55 306/1483 4.55 3.64 3 0 0 0 0 5 39 4.89 549/1426 4.89 4.11 3 0 0 0 0 3 5 36 4.75 261/1418 4.75 3.68 3 0 0 1 0 7 36 4.77 296/1416 4.77 3.56 4 2 1 0 4 9 27 4.49 290/1199 4.49 3.52 33 0 0 1 2 2 9 4.36 512/1312 4.36 3.33 31 0 0 1 1 3 11 4.50 563/1303 4.50 3.14 33 0 0 0 2 3 9 4.50 570/1299 4.50 3.13 32 4 0 1 0 1 9 4.64 ****/ 758 **** 3.71	0 0 0 0 0 3 7 37 4.72 295/1504 4.72 3.80 4.27 0 0 0 0 0 1 11 35 4.72 248/1503 4.72 3.60 4.20 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 38 4.81 201/1290 4.81 3.59 4.28 0 0 0 0 0 2 13 32 4.64 300/1453 4.64 3.76 4.21 3 2 0 2 2 9 29 4.55 290/1421 4.55 3.67 4.00 4 17 0 0 2 5 19 4.65 193/1365 4.65 3.75 4.08 2 0 0 0 0 4 14 27 4.51 444/1485 4.51 3.60 4.16 3 0 0 0 0 31 13 4.30 1248/1504 4.30 4.84 4.69 14 0 0 0 3 9 21 4.55 306/1483 4.55 3.64 4.06 3 0 0 0 0 3 5 39 4.89 549/1426 4.89 4.11 4.69 3 0 0 0 0 3 5 36 4.75 261/1418 4.75 3.68 4.25 3 0 0 1 0 7 36 4.77 296/1416 4.77 3.56 4.26 4 2 1 0 4 9 27 4.49 290/1199 4.49 3.52 3.97 33 0 0 1 2 2 2 9 4.36 512/1312 4.36 3.33 4.00 31 0 0 1 1 3 11 4.50 563/1303 4.50 3.14 4.24 33 0 0 0 2 3 9 4.50 570/1299 4.50 3.13 4.25 32 4 0 1 0 1 9 4.64 ****/ 758 **** 3.71 4.01	0 0 0 0 0 3 7 37 4.72 295/1504 4.72 3.80 4.27 4.33 0 0 0 0 1 11 35 4.72 248/1503 4.72 3.60 4.20 4.18 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 38 4.81 201/1290 4.81 3.59 4.28 4.32 0 0 0 0 0 2 13 32 4.64 300/1453 4.64 3.76 4.21 4.22 3 2 0 2 2 9 29 4.55 290/1421 4.55 3.67 4.00 4.02 4 17 0 0 2 5 19 4.65 193/1365 4.65 3.75 4.08 4.09 2 0 0 0 4 14 27 4.51 444/1485 4.51 3.60 4.16 4.14 3 0 0 0 0 31 13 4.30 1248/1504 4.30 4.84 4.69 4.73 14 0 0 0 3 9 21 4.55 306/1483 4.55 3.64 4.06 4.11 3 0 0 0 0 3 5 36 4.75 261/1418 4.75 3.68 4.25 4.25 3 0 0 1 0 7 36 4.77 296/1416 4.77 3.56 4.26 4.26 4 2 1 0 4 9 27 4.49 290/1199 4.49 3.52 3.97 4.05 3 3 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 9 4.36 512/1312 4.36 3.33 4.00 4.07 31 0 0 1 1 3 11 4.50 563/1303 4.50 3.14 4.24 4.34 33 0 0 0 0 2 3 9 4.50 570/1299 4.50 3.13 4.25 4.38 32 4 0 1 0 1 9 4.64 ****/758 **** 3.71 4.01 4.17

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	18	Under-grad	47	Non-major	41
84-150	22	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0101

ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO

Instructor: Enrollment:

Title

Baltimore County CULLUM, BRIAN Spring 2005

Page 296 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
General	0	0	0	0	0	4	_	4 56	400/1504	4 10	2 00	4 05	4 22	4 56
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56 4.63	482/1504	4.19	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.56
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	1	0 0	0	0	0	3 4	5 5	4.56	357/1503 459/1290	4.08 3.92	3.60 3.59	4.20 4.28	4.18 4.32	4.63 4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	680/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	182/1421	3.97	3.67	4.00	4.02	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	451/1365	3.13	3.75	4.08	4.09	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	180/1485	3.99	3.60	4.16	4.14	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	4.87	4.84	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	751/1483	3.91	3.64	4.06	4.11	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1425	4.80	3.94	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	4.42	4.11	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	378/1418	4.06	3.68	4.25	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	296/1416	4.29	3.56	4.26	4.26	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	329/1199	3.60	3.52	3.97	4.05	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	444/1312	3.48	3.33	4.00	4.07	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303	4.24	3.14	4.24	4.34	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	3.90	3.13	4.25	4.38	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	63/ 233	3.92	3.96	4.09	3.78	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	97/ 244	3.75	4.05	4.09	3.56	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	113/ 227	4.35	4.16	4.40	4.16	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	140/ 225	3.54	3.95	4.23	3.81	4.22
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	46/ 207	3.42	3.84	4.09	3.69	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.83	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	***	****	4.44	4.19	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	* * * *	****	4.60	4.83	****

University of Maryland

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	re not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	ificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102

ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO

CULLUM, BRIAN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 5

Title

Instructor:

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 297 Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4 00	1092/1504	4.19	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	0		1183/1503	4.08	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	0		1131/1290	3.92	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	0	0		1404/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	1		1056/1421	3.97	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1347/1365	3.13	3.75	4.08	4.09	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1246/1485	3.99	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504	4.87	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	635/1483	3.91	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	665/1425	4.80	3.94	4.41	4.38	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	1		1268/1426	4.42	4.11	4.69	4.72	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50		4.06	3.68	4.25	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1145/1416	4.29	3.56	4.26	4.26	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1115/1199	3.60	3.52	3.97	4.05	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3 00	1149/1312	3.48	3.33	4.00	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	910/1303	4.24	3.14	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1106/1299	3.90	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	***	3.71	4.01	4.17	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	2	Λ	3.60	185/ 233	3.92	3.96	4.09	3.78	3.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	206/ 244	3.75	4.05	4.09	3.76	3.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	167/ 227	4.35	4.16	4.40	4.16	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	202/ 225	3.54	3.95	4.23	3.81	3.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	197/ 207	3.42	3.84	4.09	3.69	2.80

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

Course-Section: CHEM 461 0102

ADV INSTRUMENTAL METHO

(Instr. B) Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 298 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 5

Title

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1092/1504	4.19	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1183/1503	4.08	3.60	4.20	4.18	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1131/1290	3.92	3.59	4.28	4.32	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.44	3.76	4.21	4.22	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1056/1421	3.97	3.67	4.00	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1347/1365	3.13	3.75	4.08	4.09	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1246/1485	3.99	3.60	4.16	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504	4.87	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1302/1483	3.91	3.64	4.06	4.11	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	Λ	Ω	2 00	****/1425	4.80	3.94	4.41	4.38	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	1		1319/1426	4.42	4.11	4.69	4.72	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	0	1		1330/1418	4.42	3.68	4.09	4.72	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1416		3.56	4.26	4.26	3.75
1. Did the rectard concribate to what you rearned	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	3.00	, 1110	1.25	3.30	1.20	1.20	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.48	3.33	4.00	4.07	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	910/1303	4.24	3.14	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1106/1299	3.90	3.13	4.25	4.38	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.71	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	3	Ο	3.60	185/ 233	3.92	3.96	4.09	3.78	3.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	206/ 244	3.75	4.05	4.09	3.56	3.40
. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	167/ 227	4.35	4.16	4.40	4.16	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1 0	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	202/ 225	3.54	3.95	4.23	3.81	3.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	197/ 207	3.42	3.84	4.09	3.69	2.80
	-		•	=	=	=	-		- , =					

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

Course-Section: CHEM 490 0101

SPECIAL TOPICS IN CHEM

Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 17

Title

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 299 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	Λ	Λ	Ο	1	Q	8	4.41	684/1504	4.41	3.80	4.27	4.33	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	-	11	4.59	403/1503	4.59	3.60	4.20	4.18	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	1 T	4.24	800/1290	4.24	3.59	4.28	4.10	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	/	12	4.71	230/1453	4.24	3.76	4.20	4.22	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	7	1∠		1101/1421	3.53	3.70	4.21	4.22	3.53
	0	5	0	0	0		3	4.58	- ,		3.67	4.00	4.02	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	-	-	•	•	•	2	1 2		237/1365	4.58				
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	190/1485	4.76	3.60	4.16	4.14	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	17	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.84	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	850/1483	4.00	3.64	4.06	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	818/1425	4.47	3.94	4.41	4.38	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.11	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	790/1418	4.31	3.68	4.25	4.25	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	11	5	4.18	937/1416	4.18	3.56	4.26	4.26	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2		7	4.36	412/1199	4.36	3.52	3.97	4.05	4.36
J. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding	U	3	U	U		J	,	4.50	412/1199	1.30	3.34	3.91	1.03	1.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	502/1312	4.36	3.33	4.00	4.07	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	197/1303	4.91	3.14	4.24	4.34	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	- 8	4.73	385/1299	4.73	3.13	4.25	4.38	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	66/ 758	4.89	3.71	4.01	4.17	4.89
I. Here special committees successive	•	_	ŭ	Ü		_	ŭ	1.05	00, ,00	1.07	3.71			1.05
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.29	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_		-	
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 610 0101

SPEC TOP: THEORETICL CH

Instructor: LIEBMAN, JOEL F

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

Title

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 300 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1353/1504	3.50	3.80	4.27	4.44	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1304/1503	3.50	3.60	4.20	4.28	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	3.76	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	967/1421	3.75	3.67	4.00	4.27	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.75	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1222/1485	3.67	3.60	4.16	4.24	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.84	4.69	4.79	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	3.64	4.06	4.20	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1334/1425	3.33	3.94	4.41	4.51	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.11	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1330/1418	3.00	3.68	4.25	4.36	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1281/1416	3.33	3.56	4.26	4.38	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1197/1199	1.00	3.52	3.97	4.04	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	Λ	Λ	1	Λ	2.50	1247/1312	2.50	3.33	4.00	4.31	2.50
	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	563/1303	4.50	3.14	4.24	4.58	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	Τ	7	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.14	4.24	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	U	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	1/1299	5.00	3.13	4.25	4.50	5.00

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

Course-Section: CHEM 663 0101

ANALYTICAL SEPARATIONS

Instructor: LACOURSE, WILLI

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 5

Title

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 301 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	206/1504	4.80	3.80	4.27	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	649/1503	4.40	3.60	4.20	4.28	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	832/1290	4.20	3.59	4.28	4.36	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	331/1453	4.60	3.76	4.21	4.34	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	247/1421	4.60	3.67	4.00	4.27	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	223/1365	4.60	3.75	4.08	4.35	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	591/1485	4.40	3.60	4.16	4.24	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.84	4.69	4.79	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	700/1483	4.20	3.64	4.06	4.20	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.80	3.94	4.41	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.11	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	450/1418	4.60	3.68	4.25	4.36	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.80	3.56	4.26	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.52	3.97	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	4.40	465/1312	4.40	3.33	4.00	4.31	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.40	507/1303	4.60	3.14	4.24	4.58	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	504/1299	4.60	3.14	4.25	4.56	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	84/ 758	4.80	3.71	4.01	4.24	4.80
1. Here apectar eccinitywes successful	U	U	U	U	U	_	-	1.00	34/ /30	4.00	J. / I	1.01	1.41	1.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	3	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	#### - Means there are no			
				P	0			responses to be significant				
				I	0	Other	2					
				?	0							

Course-Section: CHEM 672 0101

ENZYME REACTION MECH'I

Instructor: POLLACK, RALPH (Instr. A) Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

Title

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 302 Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General	•	•	•	•	-	_	_	4 60	226/1524	4 60	2 00	4 05		4 60
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	396/1504		3.80	4.27	4.44	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	692/1503	4.38	3.60	4.20	4.28	4.38
<ol> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> <li>Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0	1	0 1	0 2	4 2	3	4.00	937/1290 1123/1453	4.00	3.59 3.76	4.28 4.21	4.36	4.00 3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.76	4.21	4.34 4.27	3.88 4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.14	690/1365	4.14	3.75	4.00	4.27	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	3	2		1257/1485	3.57	3.60	4.06	4.35	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4		1047/1504	4.57	4.84	4.16		4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33				4.05		4.67
9. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	-		U	U	U	4	_	1.33	J43/1403	1.07	3.01	T.00	1.20	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1117/1425	4.38	3.94	4.41	4.51	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.11	4.69	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	736/1418	4.56	3.68	4.25	4.36	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	776/1416	4.50	3.56	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	129/1199	4.75	3.52	3.97	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	364/1312	4.50	3.33	4.00	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	450/1303	4.67	3.14	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1299	4.50	3.13	4.25	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.71	4.01	4.24	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.41	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 36		****	4.60	4.75	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 20	****	****	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	4.40	***

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

I 0 Other 1 ? 0

Course-Section: CHEM 672 0101

ENZYME REACTION MECH'I

(Instr. B)

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

Title

Instructor:

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 303 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	396/1504	4.63	3.80	4.27	4.44	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	692/1503	4.38	3.60	4.20	4.28	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	937/1290	4.00	3.59	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3		1123/1453	3.88	3.76	4.21	4.34	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	745/1421	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	690/1365	4.14	3.75	4.08	4.35	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	3	2		1257/1485	3.57	3.60	4.16	4.24	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4		1047/1504	4.57	4.84	4.69	4.79	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1483	4.67	3.64	4.06	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	634/1425	4.38	3.94	4.41	4.51	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.11	4.69	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	261/1418	4.56	3.68	4.25	4.36	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	498/1416	4.50	3.56	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	129/1199	4.75	3.52	3.97	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	364/1312	4.50	3.33	4.00	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	450/1303	4.67	3.14	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1299	4.50	3.13	4.25	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.71	4.01	4.24	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 58	****	3.33	4.43	4.31	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 56	***	****	4.23	4.26	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.41	****
1. 10 what degree could you discuss your evaluations	,	U	U	U	_	U	U	3.00	/ 1/			7.29	1.11	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.37	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	***	****	4.49	4.46	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.75	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	3.16	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	4.40	****

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

I 0 Other 1 ? 0