

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 100 01
Title:	The Chemical World
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	908/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	730/1559	4.44	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	561/1371	4.56	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	1060/1519	4.00	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	948/1452	4.00	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	971/1430	3.93	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	713/1539	4.38	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1098/1560	4.47	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	462/1545	4.47	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	489/1496	4.75	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	644/1498	4.88	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	560/1496	4.63	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	406/1494	4.75	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	504/1352	4.38	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	565/1248	4.40	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1132/1250	3.60	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	563/1239	4.67	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 100 01
Title:	The Chemical World
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 7	Under-grad 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 3	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	65
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	6	7	13	16	3.62	1440/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	12	11	21	4.09	1101/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	10	19	14	3.98	1091/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	1	1	6	15	7	3.87	1211/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	12	0	0	8	13	11	4.09	876/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	20	1	0	6	9	7	3.91	995/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	3	5	16	17	4.00	1077/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	22	20	4.48	1086/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	5	0	4	6	19	6	3.77	1199/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	8	6	29	4.49	898/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	2	3	8	30	4.53	1215/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	11	3	28	4.35	900/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	2	4	1	3	9	24	4.17	1054/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	5	1	4	12	16	3.87	971/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	3	5	10	20	4.08	801/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	6	5	27	4.38	725/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	2	6	5	22	3.93	1030/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	1	7	4	20	4.15	460/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	65
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	Graduate	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	22			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	Under-grad	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	9	D	1			Non-major
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives		48
				P	0			
				I	0	Other		
				?	6			

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	65
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	6	7	13	16	3.62	1440/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	12	11	21	4.09	1101/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	10	19	14	3.98	1091/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	1	1	6	15	7	3.87	1211/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	12	0	0	8	13	11	4.09	876/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	20	1	0	6	9	7	3.91	995/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	3	5	16	17	4.00	1077/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	22	20	4.48	1086/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	4	0	3	13	16	2	3.50	1342/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	710/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	2	8	20	4.60	1160/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	0	9	5	10	3.92	1238/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	3	0	5	5	14	4.00	1147/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	5	2	2	2	7	8	3.81	1018/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	3	5	10	20	4.08	801/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	6	5	27	4.38	725/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	2	6	5	22	3.93	1030/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	1	7	4	20	4.15	460/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	65
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 37	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 22		Major 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 8	General 4	Under-grad 48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 9	D 1		Non-major 48
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 6		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Macazo,F.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	65
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	6	7	13	16	3.62	1440/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	12	11	21	4.09	1101/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	10	19	14	3.98	1091/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	1	1	6	15	7	3.87	1211/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	12	0	0	8	13	11	4.09	876/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	20	1	0	6	9	7	3.91	995/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	3	5	16	17	4.00	1077/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	22	20	4.48	1086/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	3	0	3	9	18	7	3.78	1193/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	1009/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	1	3	9	17	4.40	1318/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	1	3	9	10	4.22	1026/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	3	8	11	4.13	1091/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	9	1	2	0	6	6	3.93	904/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	3	5	10	20	4.08	801/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	6	5	27	4.38	725/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	2	6	5	22	3.93	1030/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	1	7	4	20	4.15	460/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Macazo,F.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	65
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 10	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 37	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55 4	1.00-1.99 1	B 22			
56-83 2	2.00-2.99 1	C 8	General 4	Under-grad 48	Non-major 48
84-150 1	3.00-3.49 9	D 1			
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P 0			
		I 0	Other 1		
		? 6			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Szychowski,B.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	65
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	6	7	13	16	3.62	1440/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	12	11	21	4.09	1101/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	10	19	14	3.98	1091/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	1	1	6	15	7	3.87	1211/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	12	0	0	8	13	11	4.09	876/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	20	1	0	6	9	7	3.91	995/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	3	5	16	17	4.00	1077/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	22	20	4.48	1086/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	4	0	1	8	20	5	3.85	1140/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	912/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	2	11	15	4.46	1270/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	1017/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	2	7	13	4.35	911/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	9	2	1	0	3	8	4.00	823/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	3	5	10	20	4.08	801/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	6	5	27	4.38	725/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	2	6	5	22	3.93	1030/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	2	1	7	4	20	4.15	460/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Szychowski,B.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	65
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	22						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	8	General	4	Under-grad	48	Non-major	48
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	13	18	20	3.93	1261/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	26	19	4.05	1122/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	4	8	14	28	4.22	917/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	3	3	8	17	11	3.71	1319/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	5	2	13	14	16	3.68	1202/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	0	3	10	11	6	3.67	1154/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	6	11	16	19	3.92	1160/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	1	1	1	28	21	4.29	1270/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	5	0	1	8	18	15	4.12	876/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	10	40	4.65	677/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	7	44	4.74	954/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	6	17	27	4.37	866/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	2	3	15	31	4.34	922/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	2	2	5	8	29	4.30	579/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	6	9	16	15	3.75	980/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	5	11	10	20	3.85	1046/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	6	6	14	17	3.67	1127/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	4	5	3	11	20	3.88	637/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.88

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	12	General	3	Under-grad	56	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	13	18	20	3.93	1261/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	26	19	4.05	1122/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	4	8	14	28	4.22	917/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	3	3	8	17	11	3.71	1319/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	5	2	13	14	16	3.68	1202/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	0	3	10	11	6	3.67	1154/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	6	11	16	19	3.92	1160/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	1	1	1	28	21	4.29	1270/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	4	4	2	8	21	1	3.36	1407/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	7	11	21	4.28	1128/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	2	5	6	29	4.48	1262/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	3	2	7	13	11	3.75	1312/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	4	5	12	16	3.78	1291/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	5	2	2	6	6	17	4.03	808/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	6	9	16	15	3.75	980/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	5	11	10	20	3.85	1046/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	6	6	14	17	3.67	1127/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	4	5	3	11	20	3.88	637/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.88

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	12	General	3	Under-grad	56	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	13	18	20	3.93	1261/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	26	19	4.05	1122/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	4	8	14	28	4.22	917/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	3	3	8	17	11	3.71	1319/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	5	2	13	14	16	3.68	1202/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	0	3	10	11	6	3.67	1154/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	6	11	16	19	3.92	1160/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	1	1	1	28	21	4.29	1270/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	4	0	1	12	16	5	3.74	1225/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	8	10	17	4.26	1144/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	2	3	9	22	4.32	1359/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	1	1	10	6	14	3.97	1206/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	1	3	8	9	13	3.88	1241/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	8	2	2	4	3	15	4.04	808/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	6	9	16	15	3.75	980/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	5	11	10	20	3.85	1046/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	6	6	14	17	3.67	1127/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	4	5	3	11	20	3.88	637/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.88

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	12	General	3	Under-grad	56	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Schmitt,D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	13	18	20	3.93	1261/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	26	19	4.05	1122/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	4	8	14	28	4.22	917/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	3	3	8	17	11	3.71	1319/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	5	2	13	14	16	3.68	1202/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	0	3	10	11	6	3.67	1154/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	6	11	16	19	3.92	1160/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	1	1	1	28	21	4.29	1270/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	4	0	2	11	15	6	3.74	1225/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	1	7	11	16	4.20	1184/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	3	4	7	22	4.24	1395/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	1	1	10	8	12	3.91	1254/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	1	3	7	10	13	3.91	1223/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	8	2	3	3	3	15	4.00	823/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	6	9	16	15	3.75	980/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	5	11	10	20	3.85	1046/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	6	6	14	17	3.67	1127/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	4	5	3	11	20	3.88	637/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.88

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Schmitt,D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Schmitt,D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	56

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	12	General	3	Under-grad	56	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	9						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	7	8	15	3.83	1327/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	21	8	3.92	1252/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	9	10	12	3.75	1221/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	2	5	6	9	6	3.43	1437/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	4	7	8	10	3.73	1169/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	3	9	5	4	3.36	1308/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	11	12	12	3.89	1187/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	12	22	4.56	1006/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	3	0	1	7	11	4	3.78	1193/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	4	6	22	4.48	898/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	4	3	26	4.56	1199/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	8	7	19	4.23	1017/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	2	6	12	12	3.97	1181/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	4	1	4	8	12	3.79	1024/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	0	8	9	8	3.50	1079/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	3	7	6	11	3.63	1124/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	3	7	6	9	3.45	1179/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	3	2	7	8	7	3.52	774/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Olson,Wendy J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	37	Non-major	37
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	8						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	7	8	15	3.83	1327/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	21	8	3.92	1252/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	9	10	12	3.75	1221/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	2	5	6	9	6	3.43	1437/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	4	7	8	10	3.73	1169/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	3	9	5	4	3.36	1308/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	11	12	12	3.89	1187/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	12	22	4.56	1006/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	0	12	8	0	3.40	1392/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	1	0	4	3	12	4.25	1144/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	3	5	12	4.29	1378/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	0	4	6	8	4.05	1149/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	7	3	8	3.89	1236/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	1	3	2	4	4	5	3.33	1224/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	0	8	9	8	3.50	1079/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	3	7	6	11	3.63	1124/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	3	7	6	9	3.45	1179/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	3	2	7	8	7	3.52	774/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	37	Non-major	37
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	8						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Macazo,F.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	7	8	15	3.83	1327/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	21	8	3.92	1252/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	9	10	12	3.75	1221/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	2	5	6	9	6	3.43	1437/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	4	7	8	10	3.73	1169/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	3	9	5	4	3.36	1308/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	11	12	12	3.89	1187/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	12	22	4.56	1006/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	0	7	10	2	3.74	1225/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	1197/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	1374/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	1052/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	6	3	7	4.06	1122/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	2	2	2	4	2	4	3.29	1238/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	0	8	9	8	3.50	1079/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	3	7	6	11	3.63	1124/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	3	7	6	9	3.45	1179/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	3	2	7	8	7	3.52	774/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Macazo,F.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	37	Non-major	37
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	8						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,N.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	7	8	15	3.83	1327/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	21	8	3.92	1252/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	3	9	10	12	3.75	1221/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	2	5	6	9	6	3.43	1437/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	4	7	8	10	3.73	1169/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	1	3	9	5	4	3.36	1308/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	11	12	12	3.89	1187/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	2	12	22	4.56	1006/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	1	6	12	0	3.58	1309/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	1262/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	0	4	4	9	4.11	1428/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	1230/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	5	4	6	3.88	1246/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	3	3	2	4	2	3	3.00	1277/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	0	8	9	8	3.50	1079/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	3	7	6	11	3.63	1124/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	3	7	6	9	3.45	1179/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	3	2	7	8	7	3.52	774/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Carbonaro,N.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades			Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	37	Non-major	37
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	5	3	10	18	18	3.76	1380/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	2	10	18	21	3.91	1263/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	4	9	14	26	4.11	1006/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	20	1	5	6	10	13	3.83	1245/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	3	1	11	13	16	3.86	1082/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	27	2	5	5	8	7	3.48	1253/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	3	13	11	25	4.06	1047/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	4	0	0	3	24	23	4.40	1170/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	1	2	11	17	12	3.86	1131/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	7	9	35	4.48	898/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	5	8	38	4.58	1183/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	6	12	33	4.46	752/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	4	2	1	7	11	29	4.28	969/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	9	3	3	7	10	18	3.90	940/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	7	8	5	8	22	3.60	1041/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	4	12	5	25	3.86	1040/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	7	11	8	19	3.58	1146/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	9	4	8	5	17	3.40	800/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	1	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	2	B	21						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	13	General	1	Under-grad	57	Non-major	57
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	5	3	10	18	18	3.76	1380/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	2	10	18	21	3.91	1263/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	4	9	14	26	4.11	1006/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	20	1	5	6	10	13	3.83	1245/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	3	1	11	13	16	3.86	1082/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	27	2	5	5	8	7	3.48	1253/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	3	13	11	25	4.06	1047/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	4	0	0	3	24	23	4.40	1170/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	3	6	13	12	5	3.26	1444/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	1	3	6	19	4.48	898/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	1	1	3	5	22	4.44	1294/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	2	6	5	16	4.10	1123/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	1	5	9	14	4.03	1134/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	5	1	5	7	6	7	3.50	1157/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	7	8	5	8	22	3.60	1041/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	4	12	5	25	3.86	1040/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	7	11	8	19	3.58	1146/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	9	4	8	5	17	3.40	800/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	1	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	2	B	21						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	13	General	1	Under-grad	57	Non-major	57
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	5	3	10	18	18	3.76	1380/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	2	10	18	21	3.91	1263/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	4	9	14	26	4.11	1006/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	20	1	5	6	10	13	3.83	1245/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	3	1	11	13	16	3.86	1082/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	27	2	5	5	8	7	3.48	1253/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	3	13	11	25	4.06	1047/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	4	0	0	3	24	23	4.40	1170/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	4	2	1	6	18	9	3.86	1131/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	820/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	1023/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	0	1	3	3	18	4.52	677/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	4	4	15	4.33	922/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	5	1	2	2	7	8	3.95	881/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	7	8	5	8	22	3.60	1041/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	4	12	5	25	3.86	1040/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	7	11	8	19	3.58	1146/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	9	4	8	5	17	3.40	800/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	1	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Audino,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1 A 13	Required for Majors	43
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	2 B 21		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3 C 13	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 10		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Schmitt,D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	5	3	10	18	18	3.76	1380/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	2	10	18	21	3.91	1263/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	4	9	14	26	4.11	1006/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	20	1	5	6	10	13	3.83	1245/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	3	1	11	13	16	3.86	1082/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	27	2	5	5	8	7	3.48	1253/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	3	13	11	25	4.06	1047/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	4	0	0	3	24	23	4.40	1170/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	4	2	0	6	17	11	3.97	996/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	1	0	2	7	14	4.38	1037/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	0	4	5	18	4.52	1231/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	1	1	2	4	18	4.42	805/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	1	2	5	15	4.33	922/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	6	2	1	2	5	9	3.95	893/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	7	8	5	8	22	3.60	1041/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	4	4	12	5	25	3.86	1040/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	7	11	8	19	3.58	1146/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	9	4	8	5	17	3.40	800/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Schmitt,D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	1	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	1	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	54	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Schmitt,D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	57

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	2	B	21						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	13	General	1	Under-grad	57	Non-major	57
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	10						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	12	23	4.23	1008/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	16	19	4.19	1011/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	16	22	4.30	838/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	2	3	5	11	7	3.64	1353/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	2	7	18	6	3.54	1274/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	2	2	4	6	7	3.67	1154/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	17	19	4.16	955/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	21	20	4.40	1170/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	0	0	4	18	9	4.16	827/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	7	31	4.66	660/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	1023/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	11	24	4.45	766/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	1	1	11	24	4.38	870/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	1	7	9	16	4.03	813/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	7	12	18	4.13	777/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	3	13	21	4.31	781/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	6	12	18	4.13	933/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	3	0	5	10	17	4.09	491/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.09

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	12	23	4.23	1008/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	16	19	4.19	1011/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	16	22	4.30	838/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	2	3	5	11	7	3.64	1353/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	2	7	18	6	3.54	1274/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	2	2	4	6	7	3.67	1154/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	17	19	4.16	955/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	21	20	4.40	1170/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	3	11	14	2	3.50	1342/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	1	3	5	17	4.46	926/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	2	2	6	20	4.47	1270/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	2	2	5	9	11	3.86	1269/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	1	2	8	12	3.96	1181/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	3	2	0	5	5	10	3.95	881/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	7	12	18	4.13	777/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	3	13	21	4.31	781/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	6	12	18	4.13	933/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	3	0	5	10	17	4.09	491/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.09

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Macazo,F.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	12	23	4.23	1008/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	16	19	4.19	1011/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	16	22	4.30	838/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	2	3	5	11	7	3.64	1353/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	2	7	18	6	3.54	1274/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	2	2	4	6	7	3.67	1154/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	17	19	4.16	955/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	21	20	4.40	1170/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	5	11	14	4.30	679/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	782/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	1	1	5	20	4.63	1132/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	832/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	3	4	14	4.36	891/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	3	2	1	4	4	5	3.56	1135/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	7	12	18	4.13	777/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	3	13	21	4.31	781/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	6	12	18	4.13	933/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	3	0	5	10	17	4.09	491/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.09

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Macazo,F.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Macazo,F.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Schmitt,D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	12	23	4.23	1008/1560	3.87	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	16	19	4.19	1011/1559	4.03	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	16	22	4.30	838/1371	4.07	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	2	3	5	11	7	3.64	1353/1519	3.70	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	2	7	18	6	3.54	1274/1452	3.78	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	2	2	4	6	7	3.67	1154/1430	3.62	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	17	19	4.16	955/1539	4.01	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	21	20	4.40	1170/1560	4.42	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	2	7	14	7	3.87	1131/1545	3.76	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	940/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	1	1	6	19	4.59	1167/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	4	9	12	4.32	923/1496	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	3	6	12	4.27	977/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	3	2	1	4	5	4	3.50	1157/1352	3.79	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	7	12	18	4.13	777/1248	3.81	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	3	13	21	4.31	781/1250	4.01	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	6	12	18	4.13	933/1239	3.75	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	3	0	5	10	17	4.09	491/906	3.81	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.09

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Schmitt,D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Schmitt,D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	43

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	43	Non-major	43
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	14	16	13	3.75	1380/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	9	17	18	3.98	1189/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	12	15	19	4.06	1034/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	3	12	9	12	3.68	1335/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	13	17	14	3.89	1062/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	2	4	4	6	7	3.52	1233/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	20	18	4.13	997/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	2	6	18	20	4.15	1379/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	2	8	16	13	4.03	938/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	6	9	30	4.48	912/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	4	9	32	4.57	1191/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	5	14	21	4.04	1154/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	7	14	21	4.11	1106/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	9	15	16	4.05	803/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	2	10	10	15	3.80	952/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	4	3	9	23	4.23	836/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	2	7	15	13	3.90	1049/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	2	3	6	13	13	3.86	646/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 40	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 11	General 2	Under-grad 48 Non-major 47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 6		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	14	16	13	3.75	1380/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	9	17	18	3.98	1189/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	12	15	19	4.06	1034/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	3	12	9	12	3.68	1335/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	13	17	14	3.89	1062/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	2	4	4	6	7	3.52	1233/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	20	18	4.13	997/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	2	6	18	20	4.15	1379/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	2	2	14	16	4	3.47	1357/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	2	3	9	13	4.22	1168/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	2	1	3	7	16	4.17	1418/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	2	2	4	6	14	4.00	1175/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	1	2	3	3	9	10	3.81	1276/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	4	2	1	8	4	11	3.81	1018/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	2	10	10	15	3.80	952/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	4	3	9	23	4.23	836/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	2	7	15	13	3.90	1049/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	2	3	6	13	13	3.86	646/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	40	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	48	Non-major	47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Schmitt,D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	14	16	13	3.75	1380/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	9	17	18	3.98	1189/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	12	15	19	4.06	1034/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	3	12	9	12	3.68	1335/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	13	17	14	3.89	1062/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	2	4	4	6	7	3.52	1233/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	20	18	4.13	997/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	2	6	18	20	4.15	1379/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	0	10	17	10	4.00	952/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	807/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	1146/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	574/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	2	0	4	12	4.44	800/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	2	0	1	4	2	10	4.24	649/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	2	10	10	15	3.80	952/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	4	3	9	23	4.23	836/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	2	7	15	13	3.90	1049/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	2	3	6	13	13	3.86	646/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Schmitt,D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 40	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 11	General 2	Under-grad 48 Non-major 47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 6		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Szychowski,B.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	4	14	16	13	3.75	1380/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	9	17	18	3.98	1189/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	12	15	19	4.06	1034/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	3	12	9	12	3.68	1335/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	13	17	14	3.89	1062/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	24	2	4	4	6	7	3.52	1233/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	20	18	4.13	997/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	2	6	18	20	4.15	1379/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	0	1	4	24	7	4.03	938/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	807/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	1223/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	700/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	557/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	2	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	798/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	2	10	10	15	3.80	952/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	4	3	9	23	4.23	836/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	2	7	15	13	3.90	1049/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	2	3	6	13	13	3.86	646/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Szychowski,B.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	48

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 40	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 11	General 2	Under-grad 48 Non-major 47
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 6		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	3	5	22	12	3.89	1292/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	4	7	17	15	4.00	1158/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	2	1	0	8	16	16	4.12	998/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	11	1	6	5	14	6	3.56	1387/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	8	1	2	6	12	11	3.94	1023/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	22	1	2	5	8	2	3.44	1273/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	2	6	14	18	4.12	997/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	1	22	18	4.41	1158/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	2	2	6	18	6	3.71	1244/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	5	12	21	4.42	981/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	4	8	26	4.58	1183/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	2	2	7	12	15	3.95	1222/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	3	2	13	17	4.00	1147/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	1	4	5	9	15	3.97	858/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	2	6	9	13	3.66	1024/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.66
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	4	1	6	9	14	3.82	1062/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	2	4	9	17	4.09	949/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	3	1	4	7	15	4.00	519/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	3	5	22	12	3.89	1292/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	4	7	17	15	4.00	1158/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	2	1	0	8	16	16	4.12	998/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	11	1	6	5	14	6	3.56	1387/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	8	1	2	6	12	11	3.94	1023/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	22	1	2	5	8	2	3.44	1273/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	2	6	14	18	4.12	997/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	1	22	18	4.41	1158/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	1	13	11	5	3.67	1264/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	2	0	5	3	12	4.05	1268/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	1	2	1	7	14	4.24	1395/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	1	2	4	5	11	4.00	1175/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	1	2	3	9	7	3.86	1251/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	2	2	3	3	7	4	3.42	1193/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	2	6	9	13	3.66	1024/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.66
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	4	1	6	9	14	3.82	1062/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	2	4	9	17	4.09	949/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	3	1	4	7	15	4.00	519/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Audino,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	3	5	22	12	3.89	1292/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	4	7	17	15	4.00	1158/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	2	1	0	8	16	16	4.12	998/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	11	1	6	5	14	6	3.56	1387/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	8	1	2	6	12	11	3.94	1023/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	22	1	2	5	8	2	3.44	1273/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	2	6	14	18	4.12	997/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	1	22	18	4.41	1158/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	0	0	3	17	8	4.18	817/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	1047/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	1207/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	1	0	0	6	12	4.47	739/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	825/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	4	2	2	4	2	7	3.59	1128/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	2	6	9	13	3.66	1024/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.66
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	4	1	6	9	14	3.82	1062/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	2	4	9	17	4.09	949/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	3	1	4	7	15	4.00	519/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Audino,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carbonaro,N.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	3	5	22	12	3.89	1292/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	4	7	17	15	4.00	1158/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	2	1	0	8	16	16	4.12	998/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	11	1	6	5	14	6	3.56	1387/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	8	1	2	6	12	11	3.94	1023/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	22	1	2	5	8	2	3.44	1273/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	2	6	14	18	4.12	997/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	1	22	18	4.41	1158/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	1	5	14	9	4.07	912/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	845/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	1175/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	546/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	788/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	4	2	3	4	2	6	3.41	1198/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	2	6	9	13	3.66	1024/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.66
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	4	1	6	9	14	3.82	1062/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	2	4	9	17	4.09	949/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	3	1	4	7	15	4.00	519/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carbonaro,N.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	47

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	45
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	6	7	11	3.86	1313/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	8	6	11	3.89	1270/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	9	5	10	3.71	1235/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	2	7	6	7	3.58	1379/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	11	2	10	3.69	1196/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	5	8	2	7	3.39	1296/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	9	4	12	3.86	1214/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	4	7	13	4.28	1270/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	3	4	11	3	3.55	1323/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	5	3	6	13	4.00	1281/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	5	5	15	4.22	1404/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	4	7	12	3.89	1261/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	4	5	14	4.00	1147/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	2	4	4	14	4.12	754/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	9	9	4.17	739/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	5	5	12	4.17	870/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	905/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	573/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.95

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 1	A 7	Required for Majors 22	Graduate 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Major 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Non-major 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 6		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	6	7	11	3.86	1313/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	8	6	11	3.89	1270/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	9	5	10	3.71	1235/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	2	7	6	7	3.58	1379/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	11	2	10	3.69	1196/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	5	8	2	7	3.39	1296/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	9	4	12	3.86	1214/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	4	7	13	4.28	1270/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	1	2	7	7	3	3.45	1367/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	2	1	3	7	3.93	1329/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	1404/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	3	4	1	7	3.80	1293/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	2	1	9	4.21	1025/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	1	1	5	1	8	3.88	963/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	9	9	4.17	739/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	5	5	12	4.17	870/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	905/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	573/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.95

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	28
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Audino,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	6	7	11	3.86	1313/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	8	6	11	3.89	1270/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	9	5	10	3.71	1235/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	2	7	6	7	3.58	1379/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	11	2	10	3.69	1196/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	5	8	2	7	3.39	1296/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	9	4	12	3.86	1214/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	4	7	13	4.28	1270/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	2	0	2	7	9	4.05	919/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	1210/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	1	2	1	12	4.29	1374/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	2	3	1	8	3.87	1269/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	1215/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	2	0	2	1	7	3.92	928/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	9	9	4.17	739/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	5	5	12	4.17	870/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	905/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Audino,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	573/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.95

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	28
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Szychowski,B.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	6	7	11	3.86	1313/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	8	6	11	3.89	1270/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	9	5	10	3.71	1235/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	2	7	6	7	3.58	1379/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	11	2	10	3.69	1196/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	5	8	2	7	3.39	1296/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	9	4	12	3.86	1214/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	4	7	13	4.28	1270/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	777/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	1075/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	1374/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	981/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	953/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	2	1	2	1	7	3.77	1044/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	9	9	4.17	739/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	5	5	12	4.17	870/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	905/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Szychowski,B.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	66
Questionnaires:	29

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	573/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.95

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	29	Non-major	28
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	1	10	14	20	4.18	1073/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	4	6	10	25	4.24	952/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	3	7	11	24	4.24	897/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	18	0	5	7	6	9	3.70	1326/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	1	2	6	16	14	4.03	932/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	27	0	4	3	6	4	3.59	1200/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	2	5	13	23	4.25	855/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	0	0	3	14	24	4.51	1042/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	2	6	13	18	4.21	788/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	2	5	10	24	4.29	1120/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	3	7	32	4.63	1132/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	2	8	11	21	4.14	1096/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	1	3	6	9	22	4.17	1054/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	1	2	8	7	19	4.11	773/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	2	8	14	13	3.80	952/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	3	5	10	23	4.29	787/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	2	10	11	17	4.00	971/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	2	0	8	10	17	4.08	491/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.08

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors 41	Graduate 0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		Major 6
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 3	C 8	General 1	Under-grad 50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Non-major 44
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 24	F 0	Electives 3	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	1	10	14	20	4.18	1073/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	4	6	10	25	4.24	952/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	3	7	11	24	4.24	897/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	18	0	5	7	6	9	3.70	1326/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	1	2	6	16	14	4.03	932/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	27	0	4	3	6	4	3.59	1200/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	2	5	13	23	4.25	855/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	0	0	3	14	24	4.51	1042/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	2	2	16	13	4	3.41	1392/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	1	1	4	5	10	4.05	1268/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	1	0	3	5	15	4.38	1333/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	1	1	6	4	10	3.95	1214/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	1	3	2	5	4	9	3.61	1361/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	2	1	1	5	6	8	3.90	940/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	2	8	14	13	3.80	952/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	3	5	10	23	4.29	787/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	2	10	11	17	4.00	971/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	2	0	8	10	17	4.08	491/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.08

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors 41	Graduate 0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		Major 6
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 3	C 8	General 1	Under-grad 50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Non-major 44
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 24	F 0	Electives 3	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Szychowski,B.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	1	10	14	20	4.18	1073/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	4	6	10	25	4.24	952/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	3	7	11	24	4.24	897/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	18	0	5	7	6	9	3.70	1326/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	1	2	6	16	14	4.03	932/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	27	0	4	3	6	4	3.59	1200/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	2	5	13	23	4.25	855/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	0	0	3	14	24	4.51	1042/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	3	2	1	6	16	10	3.89	1115/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	1128/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	1	1	3	2	14	4.29	1378/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	1026/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	1126/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	6	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	823/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	2	8	14	13	3.80	952/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	3	5	10	23	4.29	787/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	2	10	11	17	4.00	971/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Szychowski,B.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	2	0	8	10	17	4.08	491/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.08

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors 41	Graduate 0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		Major 6
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 3	C 8	General 1	Under-grad 50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Non-major 44
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 24	F 0	Electives 3	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	1	10	14	20	4.18	1073/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	4	6	10	25	4.24	952/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	3	7	11	24	4.24	897/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	18	0	5	7	6	9	3.70	1326/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	1	2	6	16	14	4.03	932/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	27	0	4	3	6	4	3.59	1200/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	2	5	13	23	4.25	855/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	0	0	3	14	24	4.51	1042/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.51
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	3	1	0	4	20	11	4.11	876/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	1	0	3	5	9	4.17	1210/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	1	0	4	2	15	4.36	1338/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	1	1	3	5	10	4.10	1123/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	2	4	3	9	4.06	1126/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	6	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	****/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	2	8	14	13	3.80	952/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	3	5	10	23	4.29	787/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	2	10	11	17	4.00	971/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	2	0	8	10	17	4.08	491/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.08

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors 41	Graduate 0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		Major 6
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 3	C 8	General 1	Under-grad 50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Non-major 44
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 24	F 0	Electives 3	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	15	14	15	3.70	1411/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	19	15	12	3.70	1377/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	8	10	18	11	3.57	1274/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	8	8	13	11	3.61	1372/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	3	3	7	13	19	3.93	1023/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	4	4	6	9	8	3.42	1288/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	3	4	5	13	22	4.00	1077/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	2	0	6	23	18	4.12	1393/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	4	2	12	13	7	3.45	1372/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	5	7	15	20	4.00	1281/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	11	16	20	4.15	1423/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	8	13	11	14	3.56	1364/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	5	14	14	12	3.51	1381/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	7	13	9	13	3.49	1166/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	3	12	15	12	3.61	1041/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	2	10	11	19	3.98	966/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.98
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	3	12	8	17	3.77	1100/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.77
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	8	5	6	6	14	3.33	816/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	45	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	1	B	24						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	15	14	15	3.70	1411/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	19	15	12	3.70	1377/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	8	10	18	11	3.57	1274/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	8	8	13	11	3.61	1372/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	3	3	7	13	19	3.93	1023/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	4	4	6	9	8	3.42	1288/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	3	4	5	13	22	4.00	1077/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	2	0	6	23	18	4.12	1393/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	2	8	9	14	2	3.17	1461/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	1	3	3	7	12	4.00	1281/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	6	2	20	4.50	1239/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	3	4	5	6	8	3.46	1391/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	1	4	1	5	8	6	3.46	1395/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	6	5	1	6	5	5	3.18	1258/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	3	12	15	12	3.61	1041/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	2	10	11	19	3.98	966/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.98
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	3	12	8	17	3.77	1100/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.77
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	8	5	6	6	14	3.33	816/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	45	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	1	B	24						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Audino,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	15	14	15	3.70	1411/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	19	15	12	3.70	1377/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	8	10	18	11	3.57	1274/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	8	8	13	11	3.61	1372/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	3	3	7	13	19	3.93	1023/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	4	4	6	9	8	3.42	1288/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	3	4	5	13	22	4.00	1077/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	2	0	6	23	18	4.12	1393/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	1	5	18	12	4.14	856/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	3	3	6	12	4.13	1236/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	2	2	4	19	4.48	1254/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	0	1	5	5	13	4.25	990/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	1	4	6	10	4.05	1130/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	8	2	1	5	3	5	3.50	1157/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	3	12	15	12	3.61	1041/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	2	10	11	19	3.98	966/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.98
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	3	12	8	17	3.77	1100/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.77
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	8	5	6	6	14	3.33	816/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Audino,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Audino,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	45	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	1	B	24						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carbonaro,N.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	15	14	15	3.70	1411/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	19	15	12	3.70	1377/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	8	10	18	11	3.57	1274/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	8	8	13	11	3.61	1372/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	3	3	7	13	19	3.93	1023/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	4	4	6	9	8	3.42	1288/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	3	4	5	13	22	4.00	1077/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	2	0	6	23	18	4.12	1393/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	1	5	24	6	3.97	996/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	2	3	7	11	4.17	1203/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	1239/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	1	4	5	13	4.30	946/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	1110/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	8	2	0	6	4	4	3.50	1157/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	3	12	15	12	3.61	1041/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	2	10	11	19	3.98	966/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.98
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	3	12	8	17	3.77	1100/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.77
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	8	5	6	6	14	3.33	816/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carbonaro,N.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carbonaro,N.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	45	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	1	B	24						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	2	11	16	17	3.75	1386/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	1	10	15	20	3.86	1294/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	5	7	12	22	4.04	1045/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	3	5	4	10	7	3.45	1430/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	2	7	9	24	4.16	814/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	0	2	4	8	8	4.00	889/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	10	10	28	4.26	844/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	4	19	26	4.45	1122/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	4	3	9	17	9	3.57	1309/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	5	2	8	8	26	3.98	1299/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	6	7	33	4.41	1318/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	6	7	11	20	3.71	1327/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	8	3	6	10	22	3.71	1326/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	1	4	8	15	12	3.83	1002/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	3	8	16	16	3.79	963/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	3	8	10	24	4.15	884/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	3	10	7	21	3.91	1045/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	3	13	8	18	3.91	628/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.91

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	A	20	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	2	11	16	17	3.75	1386/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	1	10	15	20	3.86	1294/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	5	7	12	22	4.04	1045/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	3	5	4	10	7	3.45	1430/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	2	7	9	24	4.16	814/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	0	2	4	8	8	4.00	889/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	10	10	28	4.26	844/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	4	19	26	4.45	1122/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	4	15	15	5	3.54	1327/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	1	3	11	21	4.35	1056/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	1	4	7	25	4.51	1231/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	2	1	9	10	16	3.97	1198/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	3	9	5	16	4.03	1134/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	9	1	2	7	4	9	3.78	1031/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	3	8	16	16	3.79	963/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	3	8	10	24	4.15	884/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	3	10	7	21	3.91	1045/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	3	13	8	18	3.91	628/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.91

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	A	20	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Yoon,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	2	11	16	17	3.75	1386/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	1	10	15	20	3.86	1294/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	5	7	12	22	4.04	1045/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	3	5	4	10	7	3.45	1430/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	2	7	9	24	4.16	814/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	0	2	4	8	8	4.00	889/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	10	10	28	4.26	844/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	4	19	26	4.45	1122/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	5	5	17	14	3.90	1099/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	1	3	3	4	17	4.18	1203/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	1	9	8	18	4.19	1414/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	3	1	4	9	13	3.93	1230/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	2	6	8	11	4.04	1134/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	10	2	1	4	5	4	3.50	1157/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	3	8	16	16	3.79	963/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	3	8	10	24	4.15	884/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	3	10	7	21	3.91	1045/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	3	13	8	18	3.91	628/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.91

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Yoon,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Yoon,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	A	20	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Szychowski,B.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	2	11	16	17	3.75	1386/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	1	10	15	20	3.86	1294/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	5	7	12	22	4.04	1045/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	3	5	4	10	7	3.45	1430/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	2	7	9	24	4.16	814/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	0	2	4	8	8	4.00	889/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	10	10	28	4.26	844/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	4	19	26	4.45	1122/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	2	9	23	5	3.73	1231/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	1	2	3	5	16	4.22	1168/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	1	5	11	19	4.33	1354/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	3	0	2	10	13	4.07	1138/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	2	5	7	11	3.96	1181/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	10	2	1	4	4	5	3.56	1135/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	3	8	16	16	3.79	963/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	3	8	10	24	4.15	884/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	3	10	7	21	3.91	1045/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	3	13	8	18	3.91	628/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.91

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Szychowski,B.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Szychowski,B.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	51

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	1	A	20	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	50
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	9						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	53

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	11	15	23	4.04	1175/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	14	20	19	4.09	1094/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	13	25	4.09	1019/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	1	2	7	15	8	3.82	1254/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	1	9	13	21	4.16	814/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	1	1	14	11	5	3.56	1211/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	6	11	31	4.42	649/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	22	23	4.42	1158/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	1	1	13	19	9	3.79	1187/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	8	11	26	4.40	1009/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	5	13	28	4.45	1286/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	5	6	8	26	4.22	1017/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	8	10	23	4.11	1098/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	1	4	5	7	23	4.18	707/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	2	7	12	11	3.46	1095/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	2	7	6	22	4.13	905/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	2	9	5	20	3.95	1015/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	5	2	9	8	13	3.59	744/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.59

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	53

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	26	Required for Majors	45	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	53

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	11	15	23	4.04	1175/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	14	20	19	4.09	1094/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	13	25	4.09	1019/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	1	2	7	15	8	3.82	1254/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	1	9	13	21	4.16	814/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	1	1	14	11	5	3.56	1211/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	6	11	31	4.42	649/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	22	23	4.42	1158/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	2	19	16	2	3.46	1362/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	1	9	6	16	4.16	1217/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	1	10	5	19	4.20	1413/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	1	8	6	14	4.14	1096/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	3	2	8	4	15	3.81	1276/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	8	2	0	4	6	12	4.08	783/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	2	7	12	11	3.46	1095/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	2	7	6	22	4.13	905/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	2	9	5	20	3.95	1015/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	5	2	9	8	13	3.59	744/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.59

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	53

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	26	Required for Majors	45	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carbonaro,N.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	53

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	11	15	23	4.04	1175/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	14	20	19	4.09	1094/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	13	25	4.09	1019/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	1	2	7	15	8	3.82	1254/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	1	9	13	21	4.16	814/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	1	1	14	11	5	3.56	1211/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	6	11	31	4.42	649/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	22	23	4.42	1158/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	13	16	10	3.92	1069/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	8	6	12	4.15	1217/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	6	6	17	4.38	1333/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	0	0	8	4	12	4.17	1070/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	2	4	3	6	10	3.72	1321/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	11	2	0	3	4	5	3.71	1077/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	2	7	12	11	3.46	1095/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	2	7	6	22	4.13	905/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	2	9	5	20	3.95	1015/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	5	2	9	8	13	3.59	744/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.59

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carbonaro,N.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	53

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	26	Required for Majors	45	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Yoon,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	53

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	11	15	23	4.04	1175/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	14	20	19	4.09	1094/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	13	25	4.09	1019/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	1	2	7	15	8	3.82	1254/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	1	9	13	21	4.16	814/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	19	1	1	14	11	5	3.56	1211/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	6	11	31	4.42	649/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	22	23	4.42	1158/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	3	11	13	14	3.93	1069/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	1	5	8	14	4.25	1144/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	1	2	7	7	15	4.03	1437/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	2	0	8	1	15	4.04	1159/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	4	3	3	4	13	3.70	1331/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	12	2	0	2	4	7	3.93	904/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	2	7	12	11	3.46	1095/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	2	7	6	22	4.13	905/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	2	9	5	20	3.95	1015/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	5	2	9	8	13	3.59	744/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.59

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Yoon,J.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	53

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	50	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	26	Required for Majors	45	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	53
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	14	20	4.26	983/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	15	15	4.08	1108/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	5	7	21	4.19	952/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	1	4	11	11	3.97	1106/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	5	12	15	3.87	1082/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	2	2	7	9	4.00	889/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	14	20	4.31	798/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	22	14	4.32	1245/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	3	1	3	17	5	3.69	1254/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	4	11	18	4.11	1250/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	7	9	19	4.19	1416/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	4	7	7	15	3.68	1338/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	3	5	8	17	3.92	1223/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	4	1	5	5	18	3.97	869/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	4	11	13	3.94	887/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	3	6	19	4.22	843/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	4	9	16	4.16	916/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.16
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	2	6	6	15	4.07	498/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.07

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	14	20	4.26	983/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	15	15	4.08	1108/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	5	7	21	4.19	952/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	1	4	11	11	3.97	1106/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	5	12	15	3.87	1082/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	2	2	7	9	4.00	889/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	14	20	4.31	798/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	22	14	4.32	1245/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	2	2	8	10	6	3.57	1309/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	7	4	14	4.28	1120/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	1254/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	1	7	4	13	4.16	1070/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	9	5	7	3.82	1276/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	5	1	0	4	3	11	4.21	669/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	4	11	13	3.94	887/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	3	6	19	4.22	843/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	4	9	16	4.16	916/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.16
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	2	6	6	15	4.07	498/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.07

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Macazo,F.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	14	20	4.26	983/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	15	15	4.08	1108/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	5	7	21	4.19	952/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	1	4	11	11	3.97	1106/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	5	12	15	3.87	1082/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	2	2	7	9	4.00	889/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	14	20	4.31	798/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	22	14	4.32	1245/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	3	2	0	4	13	7	3.88	1115/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	1	4	3	12	4.30	1104/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	1262/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	2	3	4	12	4.24	1008/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	1	3	4	9	3.89	1236/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	6	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	547/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	4	11	13	3.94	887/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	3	6	19	4.22	843/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	4	9	16	4.16	916/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.16
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	2	6	6	15	4.07	498/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.07

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Macazo,F.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Macazo,F.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Schmitt,D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	14	20	4.26	983/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	15	15	4.08	1108/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	5	7	21	4.19	952/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	2	1	4	11	11	3.97	1106/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	5	12	15	3.87	1082/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	1	2	2	7	9	4.00	889/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	14	20	4.31	798/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	22	14	4.32	1245/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	3	1	0	6	11	8	3.96	1010/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	871/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	1	6	15	4.48	1262/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	739/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	985/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	6	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	547/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	4	11	13	3.94	887/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	3	6	19	4.22	843/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	4	9	16	4.16	916/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.16
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	2	6	6	15	4.07	498/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.07

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Schmitt,D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Schmitt,D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	1127/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	8	6	4	3.78	1351/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	1117/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1330/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	693/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1206/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	8	4	3.88	1194/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	14	3	4.11	1400/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	3	3	5	1	3.00	1484/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	2	2	4	5	3.53	1431/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1466/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	5	0	1	4	4	3.14	1444/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	2	1	2	5	3.00	1448/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	0	4	4	3	3.13	1265/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	9	4	4.00	822/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	1	4	8	4.07	929/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	1	1	4	7	3.87	1063/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.87

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	2	1	3	0	8	3.79	683/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.79

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Major 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 6	General 3	Under-grad 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	1127/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	8	6	4	3.78	1351/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	1117/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1330/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	693/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1206/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	8	4	3.88	1194/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	14	3	4.11	1400/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	2	4	5	2	3.36	1411/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	693/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1118/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	946/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	953/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	659/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	9	4	4.00	822/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	1	4	8	4.07	929/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	1	1	4	7	3.87	1063/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.87

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	2	1	3	0	8	3.79	683/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.79

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 6	General 3	Under-grad 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Macazo,F.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	1127/1560	3.94	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	8	6	4	3.78	1351/1559	3.96	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	1117/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1330/1519	3.67	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	693/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1206/1430	3.61	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	8	4	3.88	1194/1539	4.14	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	14	3	4.11	1400/1560	4.31	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	700/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	643/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1207/1498	4.38	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	644/1496	4.08	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	800/1494	4.00	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	659/1352	3.85	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	9	4	4.00	822/1248	3.80	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	0	1	4	8	4.07	929/1250	4.12	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	1	1	4	7	3.87	1063/1239	3.98	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.87

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 11
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Macazo,F.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	2	1	3	0	8	3.79	683/906	3.84	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.79

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Major 1
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 6	General 3	Under-grad 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102H 03
Title:	Prin Of Chem II - Honors
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	639/1560	4.53	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	284/1559	4.76	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	136/1371	4.93	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	317/1519	4.69	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	433/1452	4.50	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	266/1430	4.67	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	177/1539	4.82	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	646/1560	4.82	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	314/1545	4.60	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.46	4.49	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1498	4.94	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	532/1496	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	12	4.41	837/1494	4.41	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	335/1352	4.53	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1248	****	3.83	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1250	****	4.09	4.39	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1239	****	4.03	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102H 03
Title:	Prin Of Chem II - Honors
Instructor:	Carpenter,Tara

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	41/64	4.54	3.96	4.44	4.50	4.54
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	2	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/58	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.32	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	35/52	4.11	4.11	4.41	4.33	4.11
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	46/66	4.21	4.21	4.41	4.53	4.21
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	27/63	4.57	4.57	4.09	4.17	4.57
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	2	2	5	8	3.94	1244/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	1221/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	6	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	937/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1141/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	3	5	6	3.81	1114/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1142/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	4	8	3.74	1290/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	777/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	367/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	476/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	1122/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	669/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	84/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.35
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	0	5	10	4.29	130/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	69/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	122/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.41
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	44/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.71
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	2	5	8	3.94	1244/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	1221/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	6	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	937/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1141/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	3	5	6	3.81	1114/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1142/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	4	8	3.74	1290/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	1274/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	794/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	1023/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	1096/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	4	1	8	3.81	1276/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	2	0	2	2	6	3.83	994/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	84/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.35
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	0	5	10	4.29	130/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	69/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	122/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.41
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	44/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.71
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sundaram,Anand

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	2	5	8	3.94	1244/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	1221/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	6	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	937/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1141/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	0	3	5	6	3.81	1114/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1142/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	4	8	3.74	1290/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	4	7	1	3.43	1382/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	559/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	1175/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	981/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	1	10	4.20	1033/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	461/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sundaram,Anand

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	84/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.35
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	0	5	10	4.29	130/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	69/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	122/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.41
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	44/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.71
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	6	6	8	4.10	1136/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	9	6	4.05	1122/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	6	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	975/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	5	9	3	3.78	1281/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	5	3	9	4.00	948/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	1	6	5	4	3.59	1200/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	5	4	6	3.50	1387/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	454/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	755/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	1136/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	1262/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	1026/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	3	3	3	8	3.78	1296/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	1002/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1154/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	92/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	96/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	106/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	42/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	88/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	6	6	8	4.10	1136/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	9	6	4.05	1122/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	6	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	975/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	5	9	3	3.78	1281/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	5	3	9	4.00	948/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	1	6	5	4	3.59	1200/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	5	4	6	3.50	1387/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	454/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	7	6	3	3.75	1212/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	4	1	13	4.32	1094/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	3	3	12	4.32	1364/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	2	4	10	4.05	1149/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	3	1	4	8	3.72	1321/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1064/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1154/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	92/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	96/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	106/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	42/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	88/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Arun,Ray

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	6	6	8	4.10	1136/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	9	6	4.05	1122/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	6	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	975/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	1	5	9	3	3.78	1281/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	5	3	9	4.00	948/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	1	6	5	4	3.59	1200/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	5	4	6	3.50	1387/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	454/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	332/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	744/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1050/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	504/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	825/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	7	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	292/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1154/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Arun,Ray

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	92/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	96/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	106/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	42/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	88/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Arun,Ray

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	5	7	5	3.45	1485/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	9	1	3.23	1505/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	2	1	6	1	3.60	1264/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	3	5	7	2	3.21	1478/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	6	7	6	3.81	1121/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	9	4	1	2.94	1387/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	5	6	2	4	2.86	1498/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	877/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	5	10	4	3.95	1040/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	9	10	4.23	1168/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	903/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	8	9	4.09	1128/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	4	7	5	3.41	1407/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	7	2	7	4.00	823/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1188/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1103/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1184/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	3	1	8	9	1	3.18	202/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	3.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	2	1	4	9	6	3.73	193/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	3.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	159/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.32
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	2	2	3	6	4	5	3.35	204/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	3.35
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	6	0	3	4	8	3.38	188/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	3.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	5	7	5	3.45	1485/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	9	1	3.23	1505/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	2	1	6	1	3.60	1264/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	3	5	7	2	3.21	1478/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	6	7	6	3.81	1121/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	9	4	1	2.94	1387/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	5	6	2	4	2.86	1498/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	877/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	10	7	0	3.26	1441/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	9	6	3.82	1371/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	1382/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	6	9	4	3.59	1358/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	5	8	2	3.14	1440/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	1	6	4	3	3.47	1175/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1188/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1103/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1184/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	3	1	8	9	1	3.18	202/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	3.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	2	1	4	9	6	3.73	193/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	3.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	159/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.32
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	2	2	3	6	4	5	3.35	204/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	3.35
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	6	0	3	4	8	3.38	188/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	3.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sesmero,Ester

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	5	7	5	3.45	1485/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	9	1	3.23	1505/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	2	1	6	1	3.60	1264/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	3	5	7	2	3.21	1478/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	6	7	6	3.81	1121/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	1	9	4	1	2.94	1387/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	5	6	2	4	2.86	1498/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	2.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	877/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	4	11	3	0	2.75	1509/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	2	3	7	4	3.37	1451/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	0	10	8	4.20	1413/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	6	7	0	2.95	1462/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	6	0	3	8	2	3.00	1448/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	3	0	4	1	2	2.90	1298/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1188/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1103/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1184/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	15	6	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sesmero,Ester

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	3	1	8	9	1	3.18	202/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	3.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	2	1	4	9	6	3.73	193/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	3.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	159/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.32
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	2	2	3	6	4	5	3.35	204/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	3.35
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	6	0	3	4	8	3.38	188/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	3.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 21	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	8	6	3.91	1278/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	962/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1172/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	6	7	3.86	1220/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	3	6	2	6	3.50	1290/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	2	4	1	7	3.56	1211/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	3	3	6	3.20	1440/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	227/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	11	4	3.89	1107/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	981/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	903/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	6	12	4.33	911/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	5	3	9	3.76	1301/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	697/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	679/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1090/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1137/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	101/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.23
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	138/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.23
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	95/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	77/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	134/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.08
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Major 2
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	8	6	3.91	1278/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	962/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1172/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	6	7	3.86	1220/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	3	6	2	6	3.50	1290/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	2	4	1	7	3.56	1211/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	3	3	6	3.20	1440/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	227/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	5	12	0	3.47	1357/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	1028/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	1077/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	9	8	4.15	1079/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	7	4	7	3.67	1343/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1002/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	679/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1090/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1137/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	101/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.23
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	138/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.23
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	95/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	77/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	134/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.08
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Major 2
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sundaram,Anand

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	8	8	6	3.91	1278/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	962/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1172/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	7	6	7	3.86	1220/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	3	6	2	6	3.50	1290/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	2	4	1	7	3.56	1211/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	5	3	3	6	3.20	1440/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	227/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	9	6	4.00	952/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	643/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	1105/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	832/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	609/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	659/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	679/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1090/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1137/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sundaram,Anand

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	101/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.23
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	138/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.23
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	95/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	77/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	134/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.08
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sundaram,Anand

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Major 2
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	8	10	1	3.55	1458/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	1221/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1177/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1335/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	3	6	4	5	3.61	1245/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	4	2	7	2	3.31	1328/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	4	9	3	3.58	1366/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	272/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	10	3	4.07	912/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	5	12	4.30	1104/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	937/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	805/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	10	5	3.89	1236/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	3	1	3	7	2	3.25	1244/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	1217/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1196/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1184/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	146/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	70/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	80/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	2	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	140/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.31
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	2	7	7	4.00	144/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	8	10	1	3.55	1458/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	1221/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1177/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1335/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	3	6	4	5	3.61	1245/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	4	2	7	2	3.31	1328/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	4	9	3	3.58	1366/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	272/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	13	1	3.94	1054/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	1197/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	1333/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1035/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	1	4	7	2	3.53	1377/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	3	2	2	7	0	2.93	1293/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	1217/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1196/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1184/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	146/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	70/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	80/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	2	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	140/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.31
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	2	7	7	4.00	144/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Parker,Christin

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	8	10	1	3.55	1458/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	1221/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1177/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1335/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	3	6	4	5	3.61	1245/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	4	2	7	2	3.31	1328/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	4	9	3	3.58	1366/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	272/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	2	9	4	4.00	952/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	1281/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	2	0	3	4	6	3.80	1474/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1327/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	3	1	1	7	2	3.29	1423/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1121/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	1217/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1196/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1184/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Parker,Christin

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	146/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	70/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	80/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	2	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	140/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.31
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	2	7	7	4.00	144/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	5	7	3.89	1292/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	1077/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	1066/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	9	3	3.82	1245/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	12	4.44	506/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	971/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	7	5	1	3.00	1474/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	5	4.24	755/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	454/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	615/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	700/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	870/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	8	5	5	3.83	994/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1079/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	945/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	812/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	123/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	121/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	98/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	82/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	117/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	5	7	3.89	1292/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	1077/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	1066/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	9	3	3.82	1245/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	12	4.44	506/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	971/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	7	5	1	3.00	1474/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	12	2	3.94	1040/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	542/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	763/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	972/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	4	9	4.00	1147/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	8	5	5	3.83	994/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1079/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	945/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	812/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	123/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	121/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	98/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	82/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	117/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Orr,Casey

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	5	7	3.89	1292/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	1077/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	1066/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	9	3	3.82	1245/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	12	4.44	506/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	971/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	7	5	1	3.00	1474/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	919/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	871/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	988/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	1149/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	1241/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	5	5	2	3.62	1117/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1079/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	945/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	812/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Orr,Casey

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	123/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	121/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	98/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	82/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	117/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1252/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	856/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	573/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1016/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	670/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	493/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1200/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	670/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	846/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	332/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	920/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	1008/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	3	8	4.07	1118/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	940/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	131/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	91/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	63/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	63/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	82/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Major 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1252/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	856/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	573/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1016/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	670/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	493/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1200/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	670/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1156/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	577/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	3	0	8	4.25	1391/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1246/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	0	2	0	6	3.55	1374/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	955/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	131/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	91/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	63/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	63/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	82/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Non-major 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Nwogbo,Felix

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1252/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	856/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	573/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1016/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	670/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	493/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1200/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	670/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	4	3	3.77	1206/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1144/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	2	3	1	5	3.82	1472/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	1331/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1147/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Nwogbo,Felix

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	131/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	91/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	63/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	63/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	82/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Nwogbo,Felix

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	4	11	4.28	958/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	561/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	713/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	526/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	670/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	778/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	3	3	7	3.61	1352/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	759/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	3	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	490/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	769/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	822/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	476/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	1122/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	473/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	40/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	21/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	176/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.14
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	33/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	59/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	4	11	4.28	958/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	561/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	713/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	526/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	670/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	778/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	3	3	7	3.61	1352/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	759/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	3	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1264/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	1112/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1426/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	954/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	2	7	3	3.44	1400/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	3	0	6	6	4.00	823/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	40/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	21/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	176/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.14
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	33/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	59/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Arun,Ray

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	4	11	4.28	958/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	561/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	713/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	526/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	670/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	778/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	3	3	7	3.61	1352/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	759/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	284/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	820/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1215/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	610/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	609/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Arun, Ray

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	40/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	21/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	176/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.14
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	33/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	59/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	5	7	3.81	1349/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	5	8	3.86	1302/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	907/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	1032/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	6	9	4.14	825/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	858/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	7	4	3	3.10	1466/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	695/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	766/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	643/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	704/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	1	16	4.43	805/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	4	10	3.90	1232/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	763/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1111/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1221/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	1184/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	105/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	3	4	11	4.20	142/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	2	0	4	14	4.50	119/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	152/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	130/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.10

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Non-major 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	5	7	3.81	1349/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	5	8	3.86	1302/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	907/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	1032/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	6	9	4.14	825/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	858/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	7	4	3	3.10	1466/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	695/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	7	2	3.63	1284/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	912/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	1023/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	739/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	1	5	3	6	3.75	1306/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	916/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1111/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1221/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	1184/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	105/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	3	4	11	4.20	142/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	2	0	4	14	4.50	119/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	152/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	130/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.10

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Non-major 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sesmero,Ester

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	5	7	3.81	1349/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	5	8	3.86	1302/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	907/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	1032/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	6	9	4.14	825/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	858/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	7	4	3	3.10	1466/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	695/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	9	3	3.88	1123/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	995/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	1215/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1079/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1266/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	823/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1111/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1221/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	1184/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sesmero,Ester

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	105/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	3	4	11	4.20	142/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	2	0	4	14	4.50	119/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	152/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	130/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.10

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Non-major 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	1136/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	1122/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	838/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	847/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	320/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	718/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	1	2	7	6	3.63	1342/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	574/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	314/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	524/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	585/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	621/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	557/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	401/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	934/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	684/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	971/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	2	0	4	5	4.09	132/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.09
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	44/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	89/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	22/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	63/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.55
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	1136/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	1122/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	838/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	847/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	320/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	718/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	1	2	7	6	3.63	1342/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	574/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	11	3	4.00	952/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	995/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	1310/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	866/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	2	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	901/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	735/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	934/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	684/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	971/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	2	0	4	5	4.09	132/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.09
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	44/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	89/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	22/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	63/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.55
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Wilson, Jordan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	1136/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	5	9	4.05	1122/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	838/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	847/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	320/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	718/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	1	2	7	6	3.63	1342/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	574/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	532/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	677/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	1077/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	574/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	837/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	8	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	934/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	684/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	971/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Wilson, Jordan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	2	0	4	5	4.09	132/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.09
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	44/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	89/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	22/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	63/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.55
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 12
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	1313/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	5	7	3.80	1341/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	998/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1032/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	948/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	3	4	3	6	3.59	1200/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	5	3	7	3.50	1387/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	574/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	722/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	660/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	852/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	889/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	4	7	6	3.65	1346/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	568/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1188/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1057/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	971/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 12
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	3	0	0	4	7	3.86	174/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	3.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	117/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	104/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	105/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	93/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.36
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 12
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	1313/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	5	7	3.80	1341/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	998/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1032/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	948/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	3	4	3	6	3.59	1200/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	5	3	7	3.50	1387/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	574/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	912/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	727/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	903/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	700/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	1098/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	754/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1188/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1057/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	971/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 12
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	3	0	0	4	7	3.86	174/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	3.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	117/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	104/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	105/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	93/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.36
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 12
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kronfli,Anthony

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	1313/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	5	7	3.80	1341/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	998/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1032/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	948/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	3	4	3	6	3.59	1200/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	5	3	7	3.50	1387/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	574/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	755/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	1056/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	1318/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	752/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1069/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	940/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1188/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1057/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	971/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 12
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kronfli,Anthony

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	3	0	0	4	7	3.86	174/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	3.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	117/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	104/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	105/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	93/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.36
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 13
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	5	7	4	3.40	1497/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	9	2	3.50	1448/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	9	4	3	3.53	1292/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	3	3	8	1	3.31	1461/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	3	7	2	3.24	1369/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	6	9	0	3.35	1312/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	5	5	5	1	2.70	1506/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	2.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	478/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	3	8	2	3.60	1295/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	3	9	4.06	1265/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	1328/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1341/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	1337/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	3	3	4	5	3.73	1064/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1179/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	5	0	1	3.00	1221/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	5	0	1	3.00	1217/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	833/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 13
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	192/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	3.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	198/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	3.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	180/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.07
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	160/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.21
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	2	2	5	4	3.64	178/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	3.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 13
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	5	7	4	3.40	1497/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	9	2	3.50	1448/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	9	4	3	3.53	1292/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	3	3	8	1	3.31	1461/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	3	7	2	3.24	1369/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	6	9	0	3.35	1312/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	5	5	5	1	2.70	1506/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	2.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	478/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	1131/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	1112/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	1262/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	1061/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1246/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	3	2	5	4	3.71	1077/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1179/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	5	0	1	3.00	1221/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	5	0	1	3.00	1217/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	833/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 13
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	192/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	3.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	198/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	3.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	180/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.07
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	160/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.21
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	2	2	5	4	3.64	178/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	3.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 13
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Orr,Casey

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	5	7	4	3.40	1497/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	9	2	3.50	1448/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	9	4	3	3.53	1292/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	3	3	8	1	3.31	1461/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	3	3	7	2	3.24	1369/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	6	9	0	3.35	1312/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	5	5	5	1	2.70	1506/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	2.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	478/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	3	2	7	2	3.40	1392/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	3	5	3	6	3.71	1401/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	1310/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	1175/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1349/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	3	3	2	2	3.30	1234/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1179/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	5	0	1	3.00	1221/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	5	0	1	3.00	1217/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	833/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 13
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Orr,Casey

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	192/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	3.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	198/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	3.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	180/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.07
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	160/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.21
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	2	2	5	4	3.64	178/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	3.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 20 Non-major 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 14
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	11	4	3.75	1380/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	5	3.90	1263/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1177/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	7	3.95	1118/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	738/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	852/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	5	6	5	3.68	1318/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	727/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	912/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	871/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	852/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	946/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	993/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	763/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1037/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	717/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	949/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	688/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 14
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	125/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	165/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.07
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	165/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	163/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	74/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 14
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Major 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Non-major 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 14
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	11	4	3.75	1380/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	5	3.90	1263/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1177/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	7	3.95	1118/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	738/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	852/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	5	6	5	3.68	1318/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	727/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	7	9	0	3.56	1313/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	912/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	1338/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	10	5	4.05	1149/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	4	7	3.79	1291/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	893/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1037/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	717/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	949/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	688/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 14
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	125/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	165/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.07
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	165/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	163/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	74/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 14
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Major 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Non-major 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 14
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Russell,Sarah

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	11	4	3.75	1380/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	9	5	3.90	1263/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1177/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	7	3.95	1118/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	738/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	852/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	5	6	5	3.68	1318/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	727/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	807/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	953/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	1354/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	1017/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1098/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	823/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1037/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	717/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	949/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	688/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 14
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Russell,Sarah

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	125/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	165/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.07
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	165/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	163/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	74/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 14
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Russell,Sarah

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Major 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Non-major 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 15
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	6	8	3.91	1278/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	4	12	4.14	1049/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1066/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	4	6	8	3.86	1220/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	5	1	11	4.05	908/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	858/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	4	8	3.81	1247/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	454/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	665/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	3	13	4.24	1160/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	4	15	4.52	1223/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	1	4	13	4.24	1008/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	4	2	12	4.10	1106/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	0	1	2	10	4.20	679/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1103/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1029/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	3	0	4	3.56	1153/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 15
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	55/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.59
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	102/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.41
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	39/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	82/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.65
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	88/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 15
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 15
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	6	8	3.91	1278/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	4	12	4.14	1049/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1066/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	4	6	8	3.86	1220/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	5	1	11	4.05	908/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	858/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	4	8	3.81	1247/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	454/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	711/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	845/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	1146/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	805/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	2	13	4.10	1110/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	1	2	1	9	4.14	735/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1103/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1029/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	3	0	4	3.56	1153/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 15
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	55/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.59
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	102/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.41
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	39/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	82/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.65
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	88/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 15
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 15
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Shirron,Julie

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	6	8	3.91	1278/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	4	12	4.14	1049/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1066/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	4	6	8	3.86	1220/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	5	1	11	4.05	908/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	858/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	4	8	3.81	1247/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	454/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	639/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	807/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	1223/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	1	14	4.53	677/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	13	4.32	942/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	1	1	1	1	8	4.17	716/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1103/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	1029/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	3	0	4	3.56	1153/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 15
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Shirron,Julie

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	55/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.59
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	4	2	11	4.41	102/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.41
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	39/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	82/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.65
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	88/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 15
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Shirron,Julie

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	11	4.27	958/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	11	8	4.14	1058/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	847/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	4	7	7	4.00	1060/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	2	9	7	3.95	1002/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	1050/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	6	6	7	3.81	1247/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	227/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	1	12	5	3.95	1025/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	820/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	674/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	6	12	4.33	911/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	7	10	4.19	1040/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	4	2	13	4.19	688/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	822/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	877/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	844/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	2	0	3	7	4	3.69	182/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	3.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	146/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.19
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	92/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	97/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	119/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.19
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	11	4.27	958/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	11	8	4.14	1058/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	847/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	4	7	7	4.00	1060/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	2	9	7	3.95	1002/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	1050/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	6	6	7	3.81	1247/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	227/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	6	9	2	3.53	1332/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	912/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	1223/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	0	6	10	4.33	911/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	5	5	6	3.72	1321/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	754/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	822/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	877/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	844/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	2	0	3	7	4	3.69	182/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	3.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	146/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.19
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	92/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	97/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	119/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.19
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohnhorst,Casey

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	11	4.27	958/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	11	8	4.14	1058/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	847/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	4	7	7	4.00	1060/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	2	9	7	3.95	1002/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	1050/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	6	6	7	3.81	1247/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	227/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	9	7	4.11	886/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	693/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	920/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	766/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	679/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1131/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	822/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	877/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	844/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohnhorst, Casey

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	2	0	3	7	4	3.69	182/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	3.69
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	146/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.19
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	92/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	97/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	1	2	2	10	4.19	119/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.19
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohnhorst,Casey

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 18
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1193/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1077/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1187/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	1141/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	7	2	6	3.71	1190/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	1055/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	1278/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	759/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	406/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	727/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	903/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	889/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	1062/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	599/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1120/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	5	2	1	3.20	1204/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1142/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	852/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 18
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	102/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	1	4	4	8	3.94	177/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	152/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.35
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	68/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	114/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 18
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 9	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 18
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1193/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1077/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1187/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	1141/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	7	2	6	3.71	1190/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	1055/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	1278/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	759/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	2	5	2	2	3.17	1463/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	1265/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	1344/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1175/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	1355/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	994/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1120/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	5	2	1	3.20	1204/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1142/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	852/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 18
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	102/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	1	4	4	8	3.94	177/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	152/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.35
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	68/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	114/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 18
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohler,Sarah E

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1 A 9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3 C 1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 18
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohnhorst,Casey

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1193/1560	3.88	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1077/1559	3.99	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1187/1371	4.05	4.12	4.38	4.27	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	1141/1519	3.90	3.97	4.27	4.13	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	7	2	6	3.71	1190/1452	3.98	3.99	4.18	4.04	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	1055/1430	3.79	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	1278/1539	3.46	3.99	4.23	4.18	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	759/1560	4.87	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	639/1545	3.97	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	1009/1496	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1050/1498	4.57	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	666/1496	4.24	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	1047/1494	3.95	4.18	4.37	4.28	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	609/1352	3.93	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1120/1248	3.45	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	5	2	1	3.20	1204/1250	3.70	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1142/1239	3.73	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	852/906	3.74	3.88	4.13	3.98	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 18
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohnhorst,Casey

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	102/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	1	4	4	8	3.94	177/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.30	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	152/204	4.51	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.35
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	68/207	4.49	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	114/199	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 18
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Kohnhorst, Casey

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1 A 9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3 C 1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 124 01
Title:	Gen Organic & Biochem II
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	60
Questionnaires:	35

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	29	4.74	351/1560	4.74	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	30	4.77	272/1559	4.77	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	27	4.71	395/1371	4.71	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	330/1519	4.68	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	2	0	6	7	4.20	761/1452	4.20	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	2	1	2	12	4.41	545/1430	4.41	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	29	4.76	233/1539	4.76	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	30	3	4.09	1411/1560	4.09	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	0	2	28	4.81	143/1545	4.81	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	33	4.89	262/1496	4.89	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	34	4.94	334/1498	4.94	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	96/1496	4.94	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	34	4.89	219/1494	4.89	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	26	2	0	1	0	6	3.89	955/1352	3.89	3.94	4.12	3.98	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/1248	****	3.83	4.23	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/1250	****	4.09	4.39	4.13	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 124 01
Title:	Gen Organic & Biochem II
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	60
Questionnaires:	35

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	****/1239	****	4.03	4.45	4.18	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	31	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 02
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	376/1560	4.55	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	1	16	4.57	534/1559	4.56	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	525/1371	4.56	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	304/1519	4.51	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	2	15	4.43	530/1452	4.43	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	275/1430	4.24	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	445/1539	4.58	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	970/1560	4.75	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	406/1545	4.33	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	114/1496	4.65	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1498	4.62	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	240/1496	4.75	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	275/1494	4.66	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	240/1352	4.52	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	595/1248	4.05	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	315/1250	4.24	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	500/1239	4.00	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	296/906	4.30	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 02
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	27/206	4.78	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	8/214	4.74	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	27/204	4.66	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/207	4.64	4.47	4.44	4.50	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	11/199	4.87	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.94
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 02
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Non-major 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 02
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Davis,Brittney

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	376/1560	4.55	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	1	16	4.57	534/1559	4.56	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	525/1371	4.56	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	304/1519	4.51	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	2	15	4.43	530/1452	4.43	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	275/1430	4.24	3.84	4.16	3.98	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	445/1539	4.58	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	970/1560	4.75	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	846/1545	4.33	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	710/1496	4.65	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1239/1498	4.62	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	186/1496	4.75	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	800/1494	4.66	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1352	4.52	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	595/1248	4.05	3.83	4.23	3.95	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	315/1250	4.24	4.09	4.39	4.13	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	500/1239	4.00	4.03	4.45	4.18	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	296/906	4.30	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.43

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 02
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Davis,Brittney

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	27/206	4.78	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	8/214	4.74	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	27/204	4.66	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/207	4.64	4.47	4.44	4.50	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	11/199	4.87	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.94
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 02
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Davis,Brittny

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 03
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	8	12	4.36	852/1560	4.55	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	15	4.55	574/1559	4.56	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	609/1371	4.56	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	804/1519	4.51	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	518/1452	4.43	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	4	8	4	3.82	1050/1430	4.24	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	466/1539	4.58	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	454/1560	4.75	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	236/1545	4.33	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	2	18	4.64	693/1496	4.65	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	1	19	4.68	1050/1498	4.62	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	700/1496	4.75	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	702/1494	4.66	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	473/1352	4.52	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	2	3	7	3.73	991/1248	4.05	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	0	2	4	6	3.67	1117/1250	4.24	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	0	2	2	6	3.27	1202/1239	4.00	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.27
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	449/906	4.30	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 03
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	25/206	4.78	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	72/214	4.74	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.53
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	139/204	4.66	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	146/207	4.64	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	29/199	4.87	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.79
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 03
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 03
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Davis,Brittney

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	8	12	4.36	852/1560	4.55	4.10	4.35	4.17	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	6	15	4.55	574/1559	4.56	4.11	4.31	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	609/1371	4.56	4.12	4.38	4.27	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	804/1519	4.51	3.97	4.27	4.13	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	518/1452	4.43	3.99	4.18	4.04	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	4	8	4	3.82	1050/1430	4.24	3.84	4.16	3.98	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	466/1539	4.58	3.99	4.23	4.18	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	454/1560	4.75	4.66	4.64	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	952/1545	4.33	4.01	4.14	4.07	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	1028/1496	4.65	4.46	4.49	4.43	4.51
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	1378/1498	4.62	4.57	4.75	4.67	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	371/1496	4.75	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	289/1494	4.66	4.18	4.37	4.28	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1352	4.52	3.94	4.12	3.98	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	2	3	7	3.73	991/1248	4.05	3.83	4.23	3.95	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	0	2	4	6	3.67	1117/1250	4.24	4.09	4.39	4.13	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	5	0	2	2	6	3.27	1202/1239	4.00	4.03	4.45	4.18	3.27
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	449/906	4.30	3.88	4.13	3.98	4.17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 03
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Davis,Brittney

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	25/206	4.78	4.20	4.25	4.15	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	72/214	4.74	4.36	4.31	4.30	4.53
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	139/204	4.66	4.56	4.52	4.54	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	146/207	4.64	4.47	4.44	4.50	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	29/199	4.87	4.21	4.27	4.31	4.79
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 03
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Davis,Brittny

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	White,Ryan J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	1127/1560	4.20	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	1	11	4.22	972/1559	4.24	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	907/1371	4.24	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	907/1519	4.03	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1169/1452	3.99	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	834/1430	4.05	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	2	11	4.24	878/1539	4.27	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	4.89	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	689/1545	4.29	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	807/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	988/1498	4.70	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	779/1496	4.52	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	12	4.39	870/1494	4.35	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	547/1352	4.15	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	618/1248	4.28	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	479/1250	4.58	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	712/1239	4.46	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	4	1	7	4.00	519/906	4.09	3.88	4.13	4.14	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	White,Ryan J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	146/206	3.97	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	135/214	4.21	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	80/204	4.56	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	56/207	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	132/199	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.08
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	White,Ryan J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	1127/1560	4.20	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	1	11	4.22	972/1559	4.24	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	907/1371	4.24	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	907/1519	4.03	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1169/1452	3.99	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	834/1430	4.05	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	2	11	4.24	878/1539	4.27	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	4.89	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	2	8	4	3.93	1054/1545	4.29	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	871/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	1105/1498	4.70	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	752/1496	4.52	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	1114/1494	4.35	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	716/1352	4.15	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	618/1248	4.28	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	479/1250	4.58	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	712/1239	4.46	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	4	1	7	4.00	519/906	4.09	3.88	4.13	4.14	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	146/206	3.97	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	135/214	4.21	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	80/204	4.56	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	56/207	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	132/199	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.08
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Riley,Scott

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	1127/1560	4.20	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	1	11	4.22	972/1559	4.24	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	907/1371	4.24	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	907/1519	4.03	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1169/1452	3.99	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	834/1430	4.05	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	2	11	4.24	878/1539	4.27	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	4.89	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	406/1545	4.29	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1037/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	1077/1498	4.70	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	805/1496	4.52	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	644/1494	4.35	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1352	4.15	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	618/1248	4.28	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	479/1250	4.58	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	712/1239	4.46	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	4	1	7	4.00	519/906	4.09	3.88	4.13	4.14	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Riley,Scott

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	146/206	3.97	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	135/214	4.21	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	80/204	4.56	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	56/207	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	132/199	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.08
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Riley,Scott

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P	0						
			I	0	Other	0				
			?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Barranikova,Evg

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	1127/1560	4.20	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	1	11	4.22	972/1559	4.24	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	907/1371	4.24	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	907/1519	4.03	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1169/1452	3.99	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	834/1430	4.05	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	2	11	4.24	878/1539	4.27	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	4.89	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	807/1545	4.29	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1120/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	822/1498	4.70	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	866/1496	4.52	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	644/1494	4.35	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1352	4.15	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	618/1248	4.28	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	479/1250	4.58	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	712/1239	4.46	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	4	1	7	4.00	519/906	4.09	3.88	4.13	4.14	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Barranikova,Evg

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	146/206	3.97	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	135/214	4.21	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	80/204	4.56	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	56/207	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	132/199	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.08
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 03
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Barranikova,Evg

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	White,Ryan J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	6	13	4.29	932/1560	4.20	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	5	13	4.26	932/1559	4.24	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	6	13	4.25	887/1371	4.24	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	2	5	2	9	3.84	1228/1519	4.03	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	2	2	2	14	4.24	727/1452	3.99	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	2	0	2	2	8	4.00	889/1430	4.05	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	6	13	4.30	798/1539	4.27	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	1	0	20	4.77	743/1560	4.89	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	625/1545	4.29	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	2	17	4.50	871/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	869/1498	4.70	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	4	15	4.42	818/1496	4.52	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	632/1494	4.35	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	309/1352	4.15	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	701/1248	4.28	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	616/1250	4.58	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	721/1239	4.46	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	443/906	4.09	3.88	4.13	4.14	4.18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	White,Ryan J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	161/206	3.97	4.20	4.25	4.22	3.94
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	150/214	4.21	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	2	2	13	4.44	134/204	4.56	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	2	2	2	11	4.11	172/207	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.11
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	114/199	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	White,Ryan J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	6	13	4.29	932/1560	4.20	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	5	13	4.26	932/1559	4.24	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	6	13	4.25	887/1371	4.24	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	2	5	2	9	3.84	1228/1519	4.03	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	2	2	2	14	4.24	727/1452	3.99	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	2	0	2	2	8	4.00	889/1430	4.05	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	6	13	4.30	798/1539	4.27	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	1	0	20	4.77	743/1560	4.89	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	639/1545	4.29	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	524/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	1215/1498	4.70	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	752/1496	4.52	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	922/1494	4.35	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	7	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1139/1352	4.15	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	701/1248	4.28	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	616/1250	4.58	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	721/1239	4.46	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	443/906	4.09	3.88	4.13	4.14	4.18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	161/206	3.97	4.20	4.25	4.22	3.94
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	150/214	4.21	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	2	2	13	4.44	134/204	4.56	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	2	2	2	11	4.11	172/207	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.11
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	114/199	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Riley,Scott

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	6	13	4.29	932/1560	4.20	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	5	13	4.26	932/1559	4.24	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	6	13	4.25	887/1371	4.24	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	2	5	2	9	3.84	1228/1519	4.03	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	2	2	2	14	4.24	727/1452	3.99	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	2	0	2	2	8	4.00	889/1430	4.05	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	6	13	4.30	798/1539	4.27	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	1	0	20	4.77	743/1560	4.89	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	209/1545	4.29	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	577/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	920/1498	4.70	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	340/1496	4.52	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	788/1494	4.35	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	6	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/1352	4.15	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	701/1248	4.28	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	616/1250	4.58	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	721/1239	4.46	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	443/906	4.09	3.88	4.13	4.14	4.18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Riley,Scott

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	161/206	3.97	4.20	4.25	4.22	3.94
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	150/214	4.21	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	2	2	13	4.44	134/204	4.56	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	2	2	2	11	4.11	172/207	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.11
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	114/199	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Riley,Scott

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Barranikova,Evg

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	6	13	4.29	932/1560	4.20	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	5	13	4.26	932/1559	4.24	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	6	13	4.25	887/1371	4.24	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	2	5	2	9	3.84	1228/1519	4.03	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	2	2	2	14	4.24	727/1452	3.99	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	2	0	2	2	8	4.00	889/1430	4.05	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	6	13	4.30	798/1539	4.27	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	1	0	20	4.77	743/1560	4.89	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	0	10	8	4.00	952/1545	4.29	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	643/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	1036/1498	4.70	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	371/1496	4.52	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1276/1494	4.35	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	6	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/1352	4.15	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	5	4	12	4.23	701/1248	4.28	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	616/1250	4.58	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	721/1239	4.46	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	443/906	4.09	3.88	4.13	4.14	4.18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Barranikova,Evg

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	161/206	3.97	4.20	4.25	4.22	3.94
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	150/214	4.21	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	1	0	2	2	13	4.44	134/204	4.56	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	2	2	2	11	4.11	172/207	4.43	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.11
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	114/199	4.15	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.22
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 04
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Barranikova,Evg

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	27
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 302 01
Title:	Physical Chemistry II
Instructor:	Arnold,Bradley

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	57
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	6	7	11	4.00	1193/1560	4.00	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	8	4	14	4.23	962/1559	4.23	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	9	16	4.58	549/1371	4.58	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	503/1519	4.55	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	2	2	5	4	7	3.60	1252/1452	3.60	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	559/1430	4.40	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	6	18	4.58	466/1539	4.58	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	8	9	7	3.96	1025/1545	3.96	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	472/1496	4.76	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	988/1498	4.72	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	2	5	3	12	4.00	1175/1496	4.00	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	2	5	14	4.12	1091/1494	4.12	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	629/1352	4.25	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1248	****	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1250	****	4.09	4.39	4.47	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 302 01
Title:	Physical Chemistry II
Instructor:	Arnold,Bradley

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	57
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1239	****	4.03	4.45	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	1	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	18
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 303 01
Title:	Phys Chem For Biochem
Instructor:	Geddes,Christop

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	93
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	3	7	8	15	3.97	1218/1560	3.97	4.10	4.35	4.42	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	5	3	8	17	4.12	1068/1559	4.12	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	3	2	12	16	4.15	983/1371	4.15	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	25	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	****/1519	****	3.97	4.27	4.33	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	7	2	3	10	3	9	3.52	1286/1452	3.52	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	30	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1430	****	3.84	4.16	4.20	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	4	6	19	4.18	934/1539	4.18	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	2	0	28	4	4.00	1445/1560	4.00	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	5	8	11	6	3.60	1295/1545	3.60	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	6	8	20	4.41	995/1496	4.41	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	30	4.85	704/1498	4.85	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	7	8	15	4.00	1175/1496	4.00	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	6	6	19	4.18	1054/1494	4.18	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	1	3	8	13	4.07	788/1352	4.07	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1248	****	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1250	****	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1239	****	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	32	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 303 01
Title:	Phys Chem For Biochem
Instructor:	Geddes,Christop

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	93
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.33	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	36
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 02
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Kelly,Lisa A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.81	4.10	4.35	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1395/1559	3.90	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	779/1519	4.38	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	272/1452	4.26	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	626/1430	4.52	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1539	4.46	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	952/1545	3.94	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1496	4.61	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1498	4.83	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	911/1496	4.64	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1494	4.81	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	823/1352	4.50	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1248	4.75	3.83	4.23	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1250	4.50	4.09	4.39	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.03	4.45	4.53	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	146/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/214	4.42	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 02
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Kelly,Lisa A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/204	4.92	4.56	4.52	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/207	4.83	4.47	4.44	4.42	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	193/199	3.50	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 02
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Languirand, Eric

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.81	4.10	4.35	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1395/1559	3.90	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	779/1519	4.38	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	272/1452	4.26	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	626/1430	4.52	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1539	4.46	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	952/1545	3.94	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1281/1496	4.61	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1239/1498	4.83	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1496	4.64	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	726/1494	4.81	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	823/1352	4.50	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1248	4.75	3.83	4.23	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1250	4.50	4.09	4.39	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.03	4.45	4.53	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	146/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/214	4.42	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 02
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Languirand, Eric

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/204	4.92	4.56	4.52	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/207	4.83	4.47	4.44	4.42	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	193/199	3.50	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 02
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Strobbia,Pietro

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.81	4.10	4.35	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1395/1559	3.90	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	779/1519	4.38	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	272/1452	4.26	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	626/1430	4.52	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1539	4.46	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1419/1545	3.94	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1281/1496	4.61	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1239/1498	4.83	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	700/1496	4.64	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1494	4.81	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	823/1352	4.50	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1248	4.75	3.83	4.23	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1250	4.50	4.09	4.39	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.03	4.45	4.53	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	146/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/214	4.42	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 02
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Strobbia,Pietro

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/204	4.92	4.56	4.52	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/207	4.83	4.47	4.44	4.42	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	193/199	3.50	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 03
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Kelly,Lisa A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	514/1560	4.81	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1068/1559	3.90	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1371	5.00	4.12	4.38	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	664/1519	4.38	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1088/1452	4.26	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	219/1430	4.52	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	855/1539	4.46	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	518/1545	3.94	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1496	4.61	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1498	4.83	4.57	4.75	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	504/1496	4.64	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	532/1494	4.81	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	4.50	3.94	4.12	4.23	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	470/1248	4.75	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	945/1250	4.50	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.03	4.45	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 03
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Kelly,Lisa A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	115/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	121/214	4.42	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/204	4.92	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	77/207	4.83	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	144/199	3.50	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 03
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Languirand, Eric

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	514/1560	4.81	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1068/1559	3.90	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1371	5.00	4.12	4.38	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	664/1519	4.38	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1088/1452	4.26	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	219/1430	4.52	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	855/1539	4.46	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1140/1545	3.94	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	643/1496	4.61	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1498	4.83	4.57	4.75	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	504/1496	4.64	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1494	4.81	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	4.50	3.94	4.12	4.23	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	470/1248	4.75	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	945/1250	4.50	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.03	4.45	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 03
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Languirand, Eric

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	115/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	121/214	4.42	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/204	4.92	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	77/207	4.83	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	144/199	3.50	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 03
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Strobbia,Pietro

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	514/1560	4.81	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1068/1559	3.90	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1371	5.00	4.12	4.38	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	664/1519	4.38	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1088/1452	4.26	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	219/1430	4.52	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	855/1539	4.46	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	952/1545	3.94	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1496	4.61	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1498	4.83	4.57	4.75	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	504/1496	4.64	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1494	4.81	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	4.50	3.94	4.12	4.23	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	470/1248	4.75	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	945/1250	4.50	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.03	4.45	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 03
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Strobbia,Pietro

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	115/206	4.08	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	121/214	4.42	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	37/204	4.92	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	77/207	4.83	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	144/199	3.50	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0				
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 01
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	188
Questionnaires:	106

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	10	19	73	4.57	590/1560	4.57	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	4	11	34	54	4.34	856/1559	4.34	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	6	14	40	42	4.10	1019/1371	4.10	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	29	0	3	17	18	35	4.16	952/1519	4.16	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	10	17	72	4.55	391/1452	4.55	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	51	0	3	6	16	25	4.26	691/1430	4.26	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	6	11	30	54	4.27	832/1539	4.27	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	1	13	88	4.83	646/1560	4.83	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	1	0	0	10	27	39	4.38	572/1545	4.38	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	5	19	76	4.71	559/1496	4.71	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	5	93	4.95	334/1498	4.95	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	3	9	26	62	4.47	739/1496	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	6	8	18	67	4.47	763/1494	4.47	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	11	1	4	12	20	48	4.29	589/1352	4.29	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	75	0	1	1	8	9	12	3.97	859/1248	3.97	3.83	4.23	4.33	3.97
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	72	0	0	2	8	7	17	4.15	891/1250	4.15	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	71	0	0	0	5	11	19	4.40	765/1239	4.40	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	72	18	0	3	3	3	7	3.88	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 01
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	188
Questionnaires:	106

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	93	4	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.22	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	93	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	93	3	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	93	4	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	93	4	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	99	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	100	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	99	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	99	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	99	3	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	100	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	101	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	100	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	100	1	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	100	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	99	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	99	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	99	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 01
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	188
Questionnaires:	106

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	99	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	99	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	82	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	47						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	12	C	26	General	1	Under-grad	105	Non-major	104
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	11	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	14						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1193/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1068/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1177/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1060/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1239/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1178/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1347/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	940/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	406/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	489/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	937/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	700/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	880/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	473/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	3.22	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	175/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	150/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	184/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	199/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	176/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Resch,Lauren

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1193/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1068/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1177/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1060/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1239/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1178/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1347/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	940/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	866/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1398/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1482/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1454/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1361/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	3.22	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Resch,Lauren

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	175/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	3.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	150/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	184/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	199/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	176/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	958/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	1101/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	952/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	847/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	761/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	506/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1029/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	898/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	639/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	693/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	822/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	877/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	837/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	754/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	3.22	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	69/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	93/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	98/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	88/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	3.67	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	3.00	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	3.67	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	3.67	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	3.33	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	3.00	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	958/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	1101/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	952/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	847/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	761/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	506/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1029/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	898/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	827/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	871/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1239/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	371/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	993/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	3.22	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	69/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	93/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	98/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	88/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	3.67	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	3.00	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	3.67	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	3.67	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	3.33	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	3.00	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	0	5	3.73	1398/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1094/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1066/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	897/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	948/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	427/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	293/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	929/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	679/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	820/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	556/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	766/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	977/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	425/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1120/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1074/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1142/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	519/906	3.22	3.88	4.13	4.14	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	115/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	169/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	155/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	193/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	69/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	52/64	3.67	3.96	4.44	4.60	3.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	26/29	3.00	3.00	4.19	3.97	3.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	25/29	3.67	3.67	4.11	3.90	3.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	21/24	3.67	3.67	4.25	3.98	3.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	23/26	3.33	3.33	3.89	3.58	3.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	21/25	3.00	3.00	4.01	3.42	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Santhanam,Nithy

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	0	5	3.73	1398/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1094/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1066/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	897/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	948/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	427/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	293/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	929/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1115/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1281/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1423/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1273/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1256/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	823/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1120/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1074/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1142/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	519/906	3.22	3.88	4.13	4.14	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Santhanam,Nithy

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	115/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	169/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	155/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	193/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	3.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	69/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	52/64	3.67	3.96	4.44	4.60	3.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	26/29	3.00	3.00	4.19	3.97	3.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	25/29	3.67	3.67	4.11	3.90	3.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	21/24	3.67	3.67	4.25	3.98	3.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	23/26	3.33	3.33	3.89	3.58	3.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	21/25	3.00	3.00	4.01	3.42	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Santhanam,Nithy

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	830/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	798/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	690/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	779/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	481/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	700/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	701/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	867/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	952/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	472/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	937/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1008/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	1118/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	679/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1158/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	945/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	971/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/906	3.22	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	58/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	93/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	50/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	98/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	35/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Maharjan,Sadika

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	830/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	798/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	690/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	779/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	481/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	700/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	701/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	867/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1181/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	820/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1318/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1052/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	977/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	266/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1158/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	945/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	971/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/906	3.22	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Maharjan,Sadika

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	58/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	93/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	50/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	98/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	35/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1021/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	715/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	998/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1060/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	506/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	811/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1077/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	743/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	700/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	262/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	903/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	644/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	406/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	599/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	51/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	60/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	29/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	105/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	69/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	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	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 5		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Resch,Lauren

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1021/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	715/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	998/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1060/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	506/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	811/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1077/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	743/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	827/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	349/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1302/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	621/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1051/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.02
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	51/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Resch,Lauren

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	60/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	29/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	105/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	69/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Schoukroun,Laur

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	5	0	3.33	1513/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	1448/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1337/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	1411/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	1290/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	4	1	2.92	1394/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	2.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	1	3	3.17	1450/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	1158/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	2	5	0	3.33	1419/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1465/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1485/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.04
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1378/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1266/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1051/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1188/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1132/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1227/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	901/906	3.22	3.88	4.13	4.14	2.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Schoukroun,Laur

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	178/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	183/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	184/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	189/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	3.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	144/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/64	3.67	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	3.67	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	3.33	3.33	3.89	3.58	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Schoukroun,Laur

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	3.00	3.00	4.01	3.42	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		Non-major 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	5	0	3.33	1513/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	1448/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1337/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	1411/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	1290/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	4	1	2.92	1394/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	2.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	1	3	3.17	1450/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	1158/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	886/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	1144/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	1239/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.04
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1070/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	1147/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1109/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1188/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1132/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1227/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	2.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	901/906	3.22	3.88	4.13	4.14	2.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	178/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	183/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	184/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	189/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	3.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	144/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/64	3.67	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	3.67	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	3.33	3.33	3.89	3.58	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	3.00	3.00	4.01	3.42	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		Non-major 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1380/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	1	9	4.06	1115/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1066/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	8	4	4.07	1021/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	900/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	5	1	3	3.25	1340/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	3	3	5	3.50	1387/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	670/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	3	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	788/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	1009/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	1215/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1035/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	3	7	3.87	1251/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	2	2	4	2	3.36	1215/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	822/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	836/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	877/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	798/906	3.22	3.88	4.13	4.14	3.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	134/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.08
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	150/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	119/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	152/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	161/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Santhanam,Nithy

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1380/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	1	9	4.06	1115/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1066/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	8	4	4.07	1021/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	900/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	5	1	3	3.25	1340/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	3	3	5	3.50	1387/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	670/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	866/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1348/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1318/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1017/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1246/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	822/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	836/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	877/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	798/906	3.22	3.88	4.13	4.14	3.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Santhanam,Nithy

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	134/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.08
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	150/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	119/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	152/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	161/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1299/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	972/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	887/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	987/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	530/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1061/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1278/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	940/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	733/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	402/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	253/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	348/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/906	3.22	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	32/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	77/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	119/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	152/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	144/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	3.67	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	3.00	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	3.67	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	3.67	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/26	3.33	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	3.00	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

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

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Major 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Maharjan,Sadika

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1299/1560	3.95	4.10	4.35	4.42	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	972/1559	4.11	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	887/1371	4.01	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	987/1519	4.07	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	530/1452	4.09	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1061/1430	3.86	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1278/1539	3.90	3.99	4.23	4.27	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	940/1560	4.66	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1545	4.16	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1075/1496	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1160/1498	4.48	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1496	4.27	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	148/1352	4.18	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	348/1248	3.66	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1250	4.21	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1239	4.10	4.03	4.45	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/906	3.22	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Maharjan,Sadika

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	32/206	4.28	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	77/214	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	119/204	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	152/207	4.13	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	144/199	4.20	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	3.67	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	3.00	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	3.67	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	3.67	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/26	3.33	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	3.00	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Maharjan,Sadika

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352 01
Title:	Organic Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	221
Questionnaires:	107

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	2	9	20	73	4.58	578/1560	4.54	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	3	29	70	4.60	508/1559	4.53	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	5	14	37	48	4.23	907/1371	4.11	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	34	1	2	9	11	42	4.40	693/1519	4.33	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	3	7	19	71	4.58	350/1452	4.59	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	55	2	2	6	12	24	4.17	770/1430	4.30	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	2	7	23	69	4.57	466/1539	4.56	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	1	1	7	91	4.88	502/1560	4.83	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	3	2	1	6	21	47	4.43	518/1545	4.48	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	5	91	4.91	228/1496	4.90	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	2	94	4.96	278/1498	4.97	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	3	21	71	4.69	476/1496	4.62	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	3	22	69	4.66	532/1494	4.60	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	12	3	2	2	24	51	4.44	437/1352	4.37	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	85	0	0	2	3	8	9	4.09	****/1248	****	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	83	0	0	1	1	8	14	4.46	****/1250	****	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	84	0	0	1	4	3	15	4.39	****/1239	****	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	85	10	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352 01
Title:	Organic Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	221
Questionnaires:	107

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	103	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.22	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	103	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	103	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	103	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	103	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/199	****	4.21	4.27	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	106	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	106	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	106	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	106	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	106	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	106	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	106	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	106	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	106	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	106	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	106	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	106	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	106	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352 01
Title:	Organic Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	221
Questionnaires:	107

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	106	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	106	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	78	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	46						
56-83	18	2.00-2.99	3	C	18	General	2	Under-grad	107	Non-major	103
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	17	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	36	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	13						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	143
Questionnaires:	80

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	23	50	4.50	664/1560	4.54	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	25	47	4.47	686/1559	4.53	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	9	12	26	32	3.99	1083/1371	4.11	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.99
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	33	0	1	6	20	20	4.26	867/1519	4.33	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	7	14	56	4.60	330/1452	4.59	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	57	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	532/1430	4.30	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	21	52	4.54	508/1539	4.56	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	62	4.78	743/1560	4.83	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	1	2	24	38	4.52	387/1545	4.48	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	70	4.88	262/1496	4.90	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	75	4.97	167/1498	4.97	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	24	48	4.55	655/1496	4.62	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	18	53	4.54	690/1494	4.60	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	2	2	6	18	35	4.30	579/1352	4.37	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	65	0	0	0	5	1	9	4.27	****/1248	****	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	65	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	****/1250	****	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	65	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	****/1239	****	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	66	5	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	143
Questionnaires:	80

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	79	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	78	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	79	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	79	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors 59	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 31		Major 7
56-83	21	2.00-2.99 4	C 12	General 0	Under-grad 80
84-150	16	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		Non-major 73
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 32	F 1	Electives 7	
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 12		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	664/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	627/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	887/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1060/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	948/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1373/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	169/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	898/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	546/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	349/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	253/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	547/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	146/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	150/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	38/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	55/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Cunning,Ben

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	664/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	627/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	887/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1060/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	948/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1373/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	169/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	898/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1181/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	489/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	371/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1306/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	353/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Cunning,Ben

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	146/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	150/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	38/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	55/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	0	3	5	5	3.56	1455/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1286/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	1325/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1288/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	5	6	3.75	1155/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	983/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1041/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	670/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	899/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	1197/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	644/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	3	4	5	3.50	1378/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	4	5	3.50	1384/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	823/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	110/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.19
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	126/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	41/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.81
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	87/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	2	3	1	9	4.13	126/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Talley,Dan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	0	3	5	5	3.56	1455/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	3.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1286/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	1	4	2	2	3.30	1325/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1288/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	5	6	3.75	1155/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	983/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	1041/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	670/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	255/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1009/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1239/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1035/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	1147/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	979/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Talley,Dan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	110/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.19
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	126/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	41/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.81
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	87/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	2	3	1	9	4.13	126/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Talley,Dan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	1091/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	1309/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	937/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1016/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	5	3.77	1148/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1096/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	1029/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1024/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	8	0	3.55	1323/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	3	8	4.23	1160/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	1215/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1308/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	4	5	3.77	1301/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	128/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	2	0	1	5	3.78	188/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	184/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	176/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	0	0	3	4	3.78	165/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.78
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Meares,Adam

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	1091/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	1309/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	937/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1016/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	5	3.77	1148/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1096/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	1029/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1024/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1172/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1236/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	1440/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	1087/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1256/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Meares,Adam

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	128/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	2	0	1	5	3.78	188/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	3.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	184/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	176/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	0	0	3	4	3.78	165/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.78
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Meares,Adam

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1334/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1221/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	2	4	3	1	2.92	1361/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	2.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	5	4	3.53	1403/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	7	2	3.35	1344/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	7	3	2	3.20	1348/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	6	4	4	3.41	1411/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1158/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	8	1	3.71	1237/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	3	9	4.12	1243/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	615/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	7	6	3.88	1261/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	3	8	3.76	1301/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	3	0	1	3	3	3.30	1234/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	746/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	945/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1076/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	3	0	3	4	3	3.31	199/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	3.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	2	1	4	5	3.77	189/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	3.77
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	161/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	173/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.09
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	2	1	3	5	3.54	184/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.54

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Toonstra,Christ

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1334/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1221/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	2	4	3	1	2.92	1361/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	2.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	5	4	3.53	1403/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	7	2	3.35	1344/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	7	3	2	3.20	1348/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	6	4	4	3.41	1411/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1158/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	952/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1210/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	1215/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	1175/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1306/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	1310/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	746/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	945/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1076/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Toonstra,Christ

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	3	0	3	4	3	3.31	199/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	3.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	2	1	4	5	3.77	189/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	3.77
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	161/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	173/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.09
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	2	1	3	5	3.54	184/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.54

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	272/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	898/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	952/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	643/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1077/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	823/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Cunning,Ben

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	272/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	898/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	406/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1077/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	823/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Cunning,Ben

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	970/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	1058/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	867/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	6	4	3.86	1220/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	948/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1089/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	1077/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	766/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	1075/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	1077/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	990/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1114/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	599/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	110/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	91/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	63/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	114/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.45
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	157/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		Non-major 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Toonstra,Christ

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	970/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	1058/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	867/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	6	4	3.86	1220/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	948/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1089/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	1077/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	679/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	704/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	504/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Toonstra,Christ

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	110/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	91/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	63/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	114/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.45
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	157/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Toonstra,Christ

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		Non-major 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Gallagher, Tom

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	736/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1333/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1274/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	635/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1252/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1131/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	1	3	3.20	1440/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	454/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1212/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1144/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1477/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1105/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1355/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1157/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.45
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	125/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	112/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	152/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Gallagher, Tom

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	167/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 2	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	736/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1333/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1274/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	635/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1252/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1131/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	1	3	3.20	1440/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	454/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	886/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	693/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1052/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	1047/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1203/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.45
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	125/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	112/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	152/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	167/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Non-major 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 2	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	970/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	1158/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	2	1	5	3.64	1256/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1141/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1082/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	4	3.80	1061/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	913/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	490/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	1009/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	674/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	1096/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1281/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1084/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	166/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	180/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	3.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	147/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	176/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	134/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.08

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Childers,Kenny

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	970/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	1158/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	2	1	5	3.64	1256/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1141/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1082/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	4	3.80	1061/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	913/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	546/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1009/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1338/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	911/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	1296/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1203/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Childers,Kenny

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	166/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	3.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	180/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	3.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	147/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	176/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	134/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.08

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	886/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	686/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1066/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	969/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	835/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	803/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	986/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	574/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	827/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	559/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	389/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	621/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	775/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	0	1	5	2	3.50	1157/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	822/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	815/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	458/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	40/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	21/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	66/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	33/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	106/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Gallagher, Tom

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	886/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	686/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1066/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	969/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	835/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	803/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	986/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	574/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	892/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1047/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	1419/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	766/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	726/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	679/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	822/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	815/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	458/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Gallagher, Tom

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	40/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	21/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	66/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	33/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	106/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	664/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	833/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1134/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1010/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1088/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1039/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	901/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	898/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	572/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	437/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	532/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	690/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1238/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	94/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.30
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	63/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	43/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	92/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	104/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.30

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Talley,Dan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	664/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	833/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1134/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1010/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1088/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1039/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	901/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	898/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	172/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	577/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	556/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	294/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	332/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	823/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Talley, Dan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	94/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.30
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	63/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	43/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	92/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	104/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.30

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	808/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	993/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1167/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1202/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1155/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	889/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1077/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	743/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1123/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	744/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	556/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1114/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	922/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1131/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	146/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	63/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	43/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	45/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	82/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.40

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Meares,Adam

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	808/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	993/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1167/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	3.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1202/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1155/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	889/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1077/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	743/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	490/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	559/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	937/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	644/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	969/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	146/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	63/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	43/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	45/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Meares,Adam

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	82/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.40

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	750/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	972/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	724/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	779/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	506/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	587/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	622/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	502/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	585/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	489/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	1239/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	990/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	583/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	629/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	88/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	150/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	80/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	77/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	97/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Childers,Kenny

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	750/1560	4.31	4.10	4.35	4.42	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	972/1559	4.20	4.11	4.31	4.35	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	724/1371	3.95	4.12	4.38	4.41	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	779/1519	4.09	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	506/1452	3.93	3.99	4.18	4.21	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	587/1430	3.87	3.84	4.16	4.20	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	622/1539	4.10	3.99	4.23	4.27	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	502/1560	4.77	4.66	4.64	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	115/1545	4.20	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	349/1496	4.54	4.46	4.49	4.54	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	763/1498	4.67	4.57	4.75	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1496	4.38	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1494	4.24	4.18	4.37	4.43	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1352	3.84	3.94	4.12	4.23	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1248	4.39	3.83	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1250	4.42	4.09	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1239	4.53	4.03	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	5.00	3.88	4.13	4.14	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Childers,Kenny

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	88/206	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.22	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	150/214	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.33	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	80/204	4.68	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	77/207	4.51	4.47	4.44	4.42	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	97/199	4.18	4.21	4.27	4.17	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 405 01
Title:	Inorganic Chemistry
Instructor:	Onuta,Marie-Chr

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	1	2	3	9	9	3.96	1235/1560	3.96	4.10	4.35	4.45	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	7	5	12	4.21	993/1559	4.21	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	774/1371	4.38	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	6	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	635/1519	4.44	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	7	3	1	1	5	6	3.63	1239/1452	3.63	3.99	4.18	4.25	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	7	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	858/1430	4.06	3.84	4.16	4.25	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	4	4	16	4.50	540/1539	4.50	3.99	4.23	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	711/1560	4.79	4.66	4.64	4.68	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	3	6	5	6	3.57	1309/1545	3.57	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	871/1496	4.50	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	1278/1498	4.45	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	3	4	3	11	3.91	1254/1496	3.91	4.28	4.37	4.40	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	5	3	14	4.41	850/1494	4.41	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	5	3	8	4	3.55	1139/1352	3.55	3.94	4.12	4.16	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1248	****	3.83	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1250	****	4.09	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1239	****	4.03	4.45	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 405 01
Title:	Inorganic Chemistry
Instructor:	Onuta,Marie-Chr

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Major 18
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 4	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 25
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Non-major 12
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 8		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 02
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	808/1560	4.32	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	892/1559	4.39	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	838/1371	4.53	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	779/1519	4.14	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	670/1452	3.89	3.99	4.18	4.25	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	655/1430	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.25	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1440/1539	3.72	3.99	4.23	4.21	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1228/1560	4.40	4.66	4.64	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	360/1545	3.98	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	228/1496	4.92	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1498	4.81	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	294/1496	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	481/1494	4.75	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	659/1352	4.24	3.94	4.12	4.16	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1138/1248	3.33	3.83	4.23	4.39	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1250	4.67	4.09	4.39	4.55	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1239	****	4.03	4.45	4.61	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.28	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 02
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	32/206	4.59	4.20	4.25	4.48	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	39/214	4.70	4.36	4.31	4.37	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	184/204	4.04	4.56	4.52	4.39	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	105/207	4.42	4.47	4.44	4.49	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	180/199	3.63	4.21	4.27	4.42	3.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.55	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 02
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Brown,Jodian

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	808/1560	4.32	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	892/1559	4.39	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	838/1371	4.53	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	779/1519	4.14	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	670/1452	3.89	3.99	4.18	4.25	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	655/1430	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.25	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1440/1539	3.72	3.99	4.23	4.21	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1228/1560	4.40	4.66	4.64	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	2	3	1	3.38	1403/1545	3.98	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1496	4.92	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1239/1498	4.81	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	700/1496	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1494	4.75	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1352	4.24	3.94	4.12	4.16	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1138/1248	3.33	3.83	4.23	4.39	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1250	4.67	4.09	4.39	4.55	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1239	****	4.03	4.45	4.61	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.28	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 02
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Brown,Jodian

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	32/206	4.59	4.20	4.25	4.48	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	39/214	4.70	4.36	4.31	4.37	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	184/204	4.04	4.56	4.52	4.39	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	105/207	4.42	4.47	4.44	4.49	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	180/199	3.63	4.21	4.27	4.42	3.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.55	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 03
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	1008/1560	4.32	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	671/1559	4.39	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	314/1371	4.53	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1130/1519	4.14	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	2	2	1	4	3.50	1290/1452	3.89	3.99	4.18	4.25	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	959/1430	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.25	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	878/1539	3.72	3.99	4.23	4.21	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1086/1560	4.40	4.66	4.64	4.68	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	255/1545	3.98	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	137/1496	4.92	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1498	4.81	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	532/1496	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	219/1494	4.75	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	619/1352	4.24	3.94	4.12	4.16	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1248	3.33	3.83	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1250	4.67	4.09	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1239	****	4.03	4.45	4.61	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.28	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 03
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	71/206	4.59	4.20	4.25	4.48	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	57/214	4.70	4.36	4.31	4.37	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	180/204	4.04	4.56	4.52	4.39	4.07
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	2	1	1	0	1	9	4.33	136/207	4.42	4.47	4.44	4.49	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	0	5	1	6	3.64	178/199	3.63	4.21	4.27	4.42	3.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 03
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Khan,Mohsin

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	1008/1560	4.32	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	671/1559	4.39	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	314/1371	4.53	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1130/1519	4.14	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	2	2	1	4	3.50	1290/1452	3.89	3.99	4.18	4.25	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	959/1430	4.12	3.84	4.16	4.25	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	878/1539	3.72	3.99	4.23	4.21	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1086/1560	4.40	4.66	4.64	4.68	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	6	4	1	3.31	1431/1545	3.98	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1496	4.92	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1498	4.81	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1496	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1494	4.75	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1352	4.24	3.94	4.12	4.16	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1248	3.33	3.83	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1250	4.67	4.09	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1239	****	4.03	4.45	4.61	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.28	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 03
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Khan,Mohsin

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	19
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	71/206	4.59	4.20	4.25	4.48	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	57/214	4.70	4.36	4.31	4.37	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	180/204	4.04	4.56	4.52	4.39	4.07
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	2	1	1	0	1	9	4.33	136/207	4.42	4.47	4.44	4.49	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	0	5	1	6	3.64	178/199	3.63	4.21	4.27	4.42	3.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 438 01
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem II
Instructor:	Fishbein,James

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	79
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	7	13	17	4.27	958/1560	4.27	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	5	13	11	6	3.44	1467/1559	3.44	4.11	4.31	4.34	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	6	10	10	9	3.56	1281/1371	3.56	4.12	4.38	4.46	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	2	1	3	11	5	3.73	1313/1519	3.73	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	2	5	7	6	11	3.61	1245/1452	3.61	3.99	4.18	4.25	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	11	5	2	4	9	3	3.13	1360/1430	3.13	3.84	4.16	4.25	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	6	4	9	3	13	3.37	1417/1539	3.37	3.99	4.23	4.21	3.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	2	24	8	4.18	1357/1560	4.18	4.66	4.64	4.68	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	0	7	16	9	3.80	1181/1545	3.04	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	6	27	4.58	782/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	8	27	4.68	1064/1498	4.14	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	8	9	17	3.97	1198/1496	3.39	4.28	4.37	4.40	3.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	8	9	21	4.34	911/1494	3.67	4.18	4.37	4.41	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	20	2	2	3	3	6	3.56	1135/1352	3.38	3.94	4.12	4.16	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	****/1248	****	3.83	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	****/1250	****	4.09	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1239	****	4.03	4.45	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 438 01
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem II
Instructor:	Fishbein,James

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	79
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	36
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 438 01
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem II
Instructor:	An,Songon

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	79
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	7	13	17	4.27	958/1560	4.27	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	5	13	11	6	3.44	1467/1559	3.44	4.11	4.31	4.34	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	6	10	10	9	3.56	1281/1371	3.56	4.12	4.38	4.46	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	2	1	3	11	5	3.73	1313/1519	3.73	3.97	4.27	4.33	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	2	5	7	6	11	3.61	1245/1452	3.61	3.99	4.18	4.25	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	11	5	2	4	9	3	3.13	1360/1430	3.13	3.84	4.16	4.25	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	6	4	9	3	13	3.37	1417/1539	3.37	3.99	4.23	4.21	3.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	2	24	8	4.18	1357/1560	4.18	4.66	4.64	4.68	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	9	12	10	3	1	2.29	1533/1545	3.04	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	11	11	13	3.89	1345/1496	4.24	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	4	14	8	10	3.59	1484/1498	4.14	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	6	9	12	8	3	2.82	1474/1496	3.39	4.28	4.37	4.40	3.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	7	5	11	7	6	3.00	1448/1494	3.67	4.18	4.37	4.41	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	8	5	3	12	8	3.19	1256/1352	3.38	3.94	4.12	4.16	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	****/1248	****	3.83	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	****/1250	****	4.09	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1239	****	4.03	4.45	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 438 01
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem II
Instructor:	An,Songon

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	79
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	36
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 444 01
Title:	Molecular Modeling
Instructor:	Thorpe,Ian F

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	514/1560	4.63	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1413/1559	3.63	4.11	4.31	4.34	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1066/1371	4.00	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	867/1519	4.25	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	2.88	1420/1452	2.88	3.99	4.18	4.25	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	889/1430	4.00	3.84	4.16	4.25	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1200/1539	3.88	3.99	4.23	4.21	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	776/1560	4.75	4.66	4.64	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1156/1545	3.83	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	489/1496	4.75	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	644/1498	4.88	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1105/1496	4.13	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	726/1494	4.50	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1157/1352	3.50	3.94	4.12	4.16	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	746/1248	4.17	3.83	4.23	4.39	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	701/1250	4.40	4.09	4.39	4.55	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	765/1239	4.40	4.03	4.45	4.61	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.28	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 444 01
Title:	Molecular Modeling
Instructor:	Thorpe,Ian F

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/206	****	4.20	4.25	4.48	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.36	4.31	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.47	4.44	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 455 01
Title:	Intro Biomedical Chem
Instructor:	Radtke,Katherin

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	82
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	8	24	4.60	542/1560	4.60	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	10	22	4.51	613/1559	4.51	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	5	26	4.57	549/1371	4.57	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	9	23	4.62	421/1519	4.62	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	6	7	17	4.06	908/1452	4.06	3.99	4.18	4.25	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	21	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	795/1430	4.14	3.84	4.16	4.25	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	253/1539	4.74	3.99	4.23	4.21	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	24	4.71	857/1560	4.71	4.66	4.64	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	6	23	4.73	194/1545	4.73	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	3	30	4.82	367/1496	4.82	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	223/1498	4.97	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	5	28	4.76	355/1496	4.76	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	30	4.85	261/1494	4.85	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	1	2	24	4.71	175/1352	4.71	3.94	4.12	4.16	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	470/1248	4.50	3.83	4.23	4.39	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	542/1250	4.60	4.09	4.39	4.55	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	388/1239	4.80	4.03	4.45	4.61	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	27	3	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.28	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 455 01
Title:	Intro Biomedical Chem
Instructor:	Radtke,Katherin

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	82
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	1	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	34
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	13				
				P	3						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	7						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 02
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Cullum,Brian

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	195/1560	4.69	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	154/1559	4.74	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	328/1371	4.71	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	408/1519	4.61	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	202/1452	4.48	3.99	4.18	4.25	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1430	4.01	3.84	4.16	4.25	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1539	4.83	3.99	4.23	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	115/1545	4.53	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1496	4.80	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1498	4.58	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1496	4.45	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	233/1494	4.94	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/1352	4.55	3.94	4.12	4.16	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	470/1248	4.50	3.83	4.23	4.39	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1250	5.00	4.09	4.39	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.03	4.45	4.61	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	239/906	4.50	3.88	4.13	4.28	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 02
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Cullum,Brian

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	18/206	4.62	4.20	4.25	4.48	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	24/214	4.82	4.36	4.31	4.37	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	119/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.39	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	38/207	4.62	4.47	4.44	4.49	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	23/199	4.82	4.21	4.27	4.42	4.83

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 02
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Mang,Stephen A.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	195/1560	4.69	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	154/1559	4.74	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	328/1371	4.71	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	408/1519	4.61	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	202/1452	4.48	3.99	4.18	4.25	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1430	4.01	3.84	4.16	4.25	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1539	4.83	3.99	4.23	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1545	4.53	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1496	4.80	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	763/1498	4.58	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1496	4.45	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1494	4.94	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	470/1248	4.50	3.83	4.23	4.39	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1250	5.00	4.09	4.39	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.03	4.45	4.61	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	239/906	4.50	3.88	4.13	4.28	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	18/206	4.62	4.20	4.25	4.48	4.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 02
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	24/214	4.82	4.36	4.31	4.37	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	119/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.39	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	38/207	4.62	4.47	4.44	4.49	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	23/199	4.82	4.21	4.27	4.42	4.83

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 02
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Dahal,Sudhir

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	195/1560	4.69	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	154/1559	4.74	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	328/1371	4.71	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	408/1519	4.61	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	202/1452	4.48	3.99	4.18	4.25	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1430	4.01	3.84	4.16	4.25	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1539	4.83	3.99	4.23	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	209/1545	4.53	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	489/1496	4.80	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	763/1498	4.58	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	371/1496	4.45	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1494	4.94	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	470/1248	4.50	3.83	4.23	4.39	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1250	5.00	4.09	4.39	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.03	4.45	4.61	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	239/906	4.50	3.88	4.13	4.28	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	18/206	4.62	4.20	4.25	4.48	4.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 02
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Dahal,Sudhir

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	24/214	4.82	4.36	4.31	4.37	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	119/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.39	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	38/207	4.62	4.47	4.44	4.49	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	23/199	4.82	4.21	4.27	4.42	4.83

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 02
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Gray,Andrea

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	195/1560	4.69	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	154/1559	4.74	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	328/1371	4.71	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	408/1519	4.61	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	202/1452	4.48	3.99	4.18	4.25	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	532/1430	4.01	3.84	4.16	4.25	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1539	4.83	3.99	4.23	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	518/1545	4.53	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	489/1496	4.80	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	763/1498	4.58	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1496	4.45	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1494	4.94	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	470/1248	4.50	3.83	4.23	4.39	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1250	5.00	4.09	4.39	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.03	4.45	4.61	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	239/906	4.50	3.88	4.13	4.28	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	18/206	4.62	4.20	4.25	4.48	4.83

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 02
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Gray,Andrea

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	24/214	4.82	4.36	4.31	4.37	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	119/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.39	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	38/207	4.62	4.47	4.44	4.49	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	23/199	4.82	4.21	4.27	4.42	4.83

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 03
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Cullum,Brian

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	664/1560	4.69	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	495/1559	4.74	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	442/1371	4.71	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	435/1519	4.61	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	761/1452	4.48	3.99	4.18	4.25	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1190/1430	4.01	3.84	4.16	4.25	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	349/1539	4.83	3.99	4.23	4.21	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	733/1545	4.53	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	871/1496	4.80	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1077/1498	4.58	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	700/1496	4.45	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1494	4.94	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	629/1352	4.55	3.94	4.12	4.16	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	74/206	4.62	4.20	4.25	4.48	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	30/214	4.82	4.36	4.31	4.37	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	98/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.39	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	124/207	4.62	4.47	4.44	4.49	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	26/199	4.82	4.21	4.27	4.42	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 03
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Cullum,Brian

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	4.40	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 03
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Cullum,Brian

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 03
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Mang,Stephen A.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	664/1560	4.69	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	495/1559	4.74	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	442/1371	4.71	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	435/1519	4.61	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	761/1452	4.48	3.99	4.18	4.25	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1190/1430	4.01	3.84	4.16	4.25	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	349/1539	4.83	3.99	4.23	4.21	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	406/1545	4.53	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1496	4.80	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1239/1498	4.58	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1485/1496	4.45	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1494	4.94	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	74/206	4.62	4.20	4.25	4.48	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	30/214	4.82	4.36	4.31	4.37	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	98/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.39	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	124/207	4.62	4.47	4.44	4.49	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	26/199	4.82	4.21	4.27	4.42	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 03
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	4.40	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 03
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 03
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Dahal,Sudhir

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	664/1560	4.69	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	495/1559	4.74	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	442/1371	4.71	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	435/1519	4.61	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	761/1452	4.48	3.99	4.18	4.25	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1190/1430	4.01	3.84	4.16	4.25	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	349/1539	4.83	3.99	4.23	4.21	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	406/1545	4.53	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1496	4.80	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1440/1498	4.58	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	700/1496	4.45	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1494	4.94	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	74/206	4.62	4.20	4.25	4.48	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	30/214	4.82	4.36	4.31	4.37	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	98/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.39	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	124/207	4.62	4.47	4.44	4.49	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	26/199	4.82	4.21	4.27	4.42	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 03
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Dahal,Sudhir

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	4.40	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 03
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Dahal,Sudhir

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 03
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Gray,Andrea

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	664/1560	4.69	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	495/1559	4.74	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	442/1371	4.71	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	435/1519	4.61	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	761/1452	4.48	3.99	4.18	4.25	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1190/1430	4.01	3.84	4.16	4.25	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	349/1539	4.83	3.99	4.23	4.21	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.66	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	952/1545	4.53	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1496	4.80	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1440/1498	4.58	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	700/1496	4.45	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1494	4.94	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	74/206	4.62	4.20	4.25	4.48	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	30/214	4.82	4.36	4.31	4.37	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	98/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.39	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	124/207	4.62	4.47	4.44	4.49	4.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	26/199	4.82	4.21	4.27	4.42	4.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 03
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Gray,Andrea

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	3.96	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	5.00	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	4.11	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.21	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	4.57	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.00	4.19	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	3.67	4.11	4.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	3.67	4.25	4.40	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	3.33	3.89	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	3.00	4.01	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 03
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Gray,Andrea

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 490 01
Title:	Special Topics In Chem
Instructor:	Summers,Michael

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	4.83	4.10	4.35	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1158/1559	4.52	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1066/1371	4.35	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1060/1519	4.22	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1397/1452	3.69	3.99	4.18	4.25	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	889/1430	4.41	3.84	4.16	4.25	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1077/1539	4.28	3.99	4.23	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1445/1560	4.47	4.66	4.64	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	406/1545	4.21	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	871/1496	4.77	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1498	4.89	4.57	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	700/1496	4.30	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1494	4.76	4.18	4.37	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1277/1352	2.81	3.94	4.12	4.16	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1079/1248	3.50	3.83	4.23	4.39	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1154/1250	3.50	4.09	4.39	4.55	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 490 01
Title:	Special Topics In Chem
Instructor:	Summers,Michael

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1164/1239	3.50	4.03	4.45	4.61	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 490 02
Title:	Special Topics In Chem
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	664/1560	4.83	4.10	4.35	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	178/1559	4.52	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	774/1371	4.35	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	837/1519	4.22	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1290/1452	3.69	3.99	4.18	4.25	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	626/1430	4.41	3.84	4.16	4.25	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	855/1539	4.28	3.99	4.23	4.21	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	4.47	4.66	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1342/1545	4.21	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1496	4.77	4.46	4.49	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	704/1498	4.89	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	1175/1496	4.30	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	644/1494	4.76	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1350/1352	2.81	3.94	4.12	4.16	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1248	3.50	3.83	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1250	3.50	4.09	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1239	3.50	4.03	4.45	4.61	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 490 02
Title:	Special Topics In Chem
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/906	****	3.88	4.13	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 490 03
Title:	Special Topics In Chem
Instructor:	Garcin,Elsa D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	4.83	4.10	4.35	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	357/1559	4.52	4.11	4.31	4.34	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	442/1371	4.35	4.12	4.38	4.46	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	730/1519	4.22	3.97	4.27	4.33	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	360/1452	3.69	3.99	4.18	4.25	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	93/1430	4.41	3.84	4.16	4.25	4.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	435/1539	4.28	3.99	4.23	4.21	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1170/1560	4.47	4.66	4.64	4.68	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	294/1545	4.21	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	402/1496	4.77	4.46	4.49	4.50	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	852/1498	4.89	4.57	4.75	4.77	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	832/1496	4.30	4.28	4.37	4.40	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	481/1494	4.76	4.18	4.37	4.41	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	425/1352	2.81	3.94	4.12	4.16	4.44

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

[Report Help](#)

Course-Section:	CHEM 490 03
Title:	Special Topics In Chem
Instructor:	Garcin,Elsa D.

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1248	3.50	3.83	4.23	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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