

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 229
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	20	22	6	3.59	1462/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	15	25	11	3.92	1227/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	17	15	13	3.67	1219/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	2	14	15	2	3.44	1431/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	9	10	14	9	3.43	1282/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	5	4	10	5	1	2.72	1465/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	2.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	8	12	24	4.04	1016/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	2	0	4	43	4.80	825/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	0	7	23	7	4.00	889/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	41	4.78	397/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	7	41	4.74	925/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	5	22	21	4.27	875/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	15	30	4.48	664/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	11	17	18	4.02	613/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	7	11	12	13	3.34	1180/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.34	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	10	5	8	14	14	3.33	1265/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	9	3	14	16	8	3.22	1277/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	10	6	11	6	15	3.21	818/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.21	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 229
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	4	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	49
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	3						
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	42				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 230
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	20	22	6	3.59	1462/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	15	25	11	3.92	1227/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	17	15	13	3.67	1219/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	2	14	15	2	3.44	1431/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	9	10	14	9	3.43	1282/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	5	4	10	5	1	2.72	1465/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	2.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	8	12	24	4.04	1016/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	2	0	4	43	4.80	825/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	2	4	15	11	4	3.31	1402/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	1	4	8	18	4.39	968/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	1	3	7	20	4.48	1205/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	2	3	2	9	12	3.93	1162/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	3	1	3	6	13	3.96	1110/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	2	3	2	4	6	12	3.81	798/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	7	11	12	13	3.34	1180/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.34	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	10	5	8	14	14	3.33	1265/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	9	3	14	16	8	3.22	1277/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	10	6	11	6	15	3.21	818/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.21	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 230
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	4	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	49
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	3						
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	42				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: FEDOROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 231
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	20	22	6	3.59	1462/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	15	25	11	3.92	1227/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	17	15	13	3.67	1219/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	2	14	15	2	3.44	1431/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	9	10	14	9	3.43	1282/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	5	4	10	5	1	2.72	1465/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	2.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	8	12	24	4.04	1016/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	2	0	4	43	4.80	825/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	1	0	15	12	6	3.65	1245/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	1	1	7	6	12	4.00	1237/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	1	3	11	12	4.26	1356/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	2	2	3	10	10	3.89	1193/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	2	2	2	4	5	10	3.83	1204/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	5	3	4	3	8	4	3.27	1093/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	7	11	12	13	3.34	1180/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.34	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	10	5	8	14	14	3.33	1265/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	9	3	14	16	8	3.22	1277/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	10	6	11	6	15	3.21	818/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.21	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: FEDOROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 231
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	4	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	49
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	3						
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	42				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 232
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	20	22	6	3.59	1462/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	15	25	11	3.92	1227/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	17	15	13	3.67	1219/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	2	14	15	2	3.44	1431/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	9	10	14	9	3.43	1282/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	5	4	10	5	1	2.72	1465/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	2.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	8	12	24	4.04	1016/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	2	0	4	43	4.80	825/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	1	1	7	15	7	3.84	1109/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	1	1	5	5	14	4.15	1169/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	1	1	2	10	13	4.22	1367/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	2	2	3	8	11	3.92	1162/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	2	2	2	5	4	11	3.83	1198/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	5	3	2	1	9	6	3.62	923/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	7	11	12	13	3.34	1180/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.34	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	10	5	8	14	14	3.33	1265/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	9	3	14	16	8	3.22	1277/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	10	6	11	6	15	3.21	818/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.21	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	49	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	49	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	49	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 232
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	4	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	51	Non-major	49
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	3						
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	42				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 233
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	3	13	32	12	3.84	1303/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	13	28	19	3.97	1158/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	6	17	21	16	3.69	1204/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	7	8	14	10	8	3.09	1522/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	7	14	18	19	3.70	1104/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	7	7	7	11	7	3.10	1392/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	5	8	18	28	4.07	1003/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	2	0	12	46	4.64	1034/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	1	7	26	17	4.16	772/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	14	46	4.66	602/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	58	4.92	491/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	7	16	37	4.46	661/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	5	10	43	4.55	580/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	3	3	6	15	33	4.20	505/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	6	16	15	18	3.50	1106/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	5	9	11	34	4.10	940/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	13	3	12	11	21	3.40	1226/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	6	7	6	20	21	3.72	636/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.72	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	3	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	2	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	2	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	2	0	4	0	3	3.22	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	2	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 233
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	4	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	16	General	0	Under-grad	63	Non-major	63
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	43				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 234
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	3	13	32	12	3.84	1303/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	13	28	19	3.97	1158/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	6	17	21	16	3.69	1204/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	7	8	14	10	8	3.09	1522/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	7	14	18	19	3.70	1104/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	7	7	7	11	7	3.10	1392/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	5	8	18	28	4.07	1003/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	2	0	12	46	4.64	1034/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	5	7	26	14	1	2.98	1484/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	4	4	8	8	26	3.96	1269/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	3	10	9	27	4.16	1383/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	2	5	16	9	16	3.67	1292/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	1	4	9	10	8	17	3.52	1321/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	6	7	9	9	15	3.43	1017/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	6	16	15	18	3.50	1106/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	5	9	11	34	4.10	940/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	13	3	12	11	21	3.40	1226/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	6	7	6	20	21	3.72	636/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.72	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	3	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	2	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	2	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	2	0	4	0	3	3.22	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	2	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 234
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	4	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	16	General	0	Under-grad	63	Non-major	63
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	43				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: FEDOROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 235
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	3	13	32	12	3.84	1303/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	13	28	19	3.97	1158/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	6	17	21	16	3.69	1204/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	7	8	14	10	8	3.09	1522/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	7	14	18	19	3.70	1104/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	7	7	7	11	7	3.10	1392/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	5	8	18	28	4.07	1003/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	2	0	12	46	4.64	1034/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	6	5	6	19	11	4	3.07	1468/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	7	2	10	9	13	3.46	1428/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	2	1	12	16	15	3.89	1445/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	6	3	9	12	11	3.46	1361/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	8	7	6	5	16	3.33	1385/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	12	5	4	6	9	8	3.34	1062/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	6	16	15	18	3.50	1106/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	5	9	11	34	4.10	940/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	13	3	12	11	21	3.40	1226/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	6	7	6	20	21	3.72	636/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.72	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	3	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	2	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	2	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	2	0	4	0	3	3.22	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	2	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: FEDOROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 235
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	4	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	16	General	0	Under-grad	63	Non-major	63
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	43				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 236
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	3	13	32	12	3.84	1303/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	13	28	19	3.97	1158/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	6	17	21	16	3.69	1204/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	7	8	14	10	8	3.09	1522/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	7	14	18	19	3.70	1104/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	23	7	7	7	11	7	3.10	1392/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	5	8	18	28	4.07	1003/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	2	0	12	46	4.64	1034/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	2	10	28	12	3.96	955/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	4	1	6	9	24	4.09	1206/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	6	15	26	4.43	1256/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	1	4	7	13	17	3.98	1112/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	5	6	3	9	21	3.80	1219/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	12	4	4	6	9	10	3.52	973/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	6	16	15	18	3.50	1106/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	5	9	11	34	4.10	940/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	13	3	12	11	21	3.40	1226/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	6	7	6	20	21	3.72	636/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.72	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	3	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	2	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	2	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	2	0	4	0	3	3.22	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	2	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 236
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	4	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	16	General	0	Under-grad	63	Non-major	63
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	43				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 237
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	5	11	24	14	3.63	1441/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	12	25	16	3.81	1319/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	5	9	23	17	3.71	1195/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	9	5	15	9	7	3.00	1532/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	4	19	15	12	3.70	1104/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	34	3	4	9	3	4	3.04	1405/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	7	11	16	21	3.82	1237/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	2	1	7	45	4.73	928/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	2	0	2	1	26	15	4.23	691/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	9	46	4.74	472/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	3	7	46	4.67	1019/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	1	4	19	29	4.31	833/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	2	6	15	31	4.27	890/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	4	5	11	32	4.24	466/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	6	7	10	17	14	3.48	1117/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	8	9	8	28	4.00	983/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	7	6	16	13	11	3.28	1262/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	11	8	12	11	11	3.06	837/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.06	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	3	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	1	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	3	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	1	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	2	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	4	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	3	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	1	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	2	0	4	1	0	2.57	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	1	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	1	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 237
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	59	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
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	41				
				?	5						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 238
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	5	11	24	14	3.63	1441/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	12	25	16	3.81	1319/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	5	9	23	17	3.71	1195/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	9	5	15	9	7	3.00	1532/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	4	19	15	12	3.70	1104/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	34	3	4	9	3	4	3.04	1405/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	7	11	16	21	3.82	1237/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	2	1	7	45	4.73	928/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	2	4	19	15	2	3.26	1416/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	1	6	13	24	4.36	989/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	1	9	8	27	4.36	1305/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	2	12	11	10	3.83	1229/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	3	8	11	11	3.74	1241/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	2	2	5	10	4	15	3.69	876/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	6	7	10	17	14	3.48	1117/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	8	9	8	28	4.00	983/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	7	6	16	13	11	3.28	1262/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	11	8	12	11	11	3.06	837/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.06	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	3	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	1	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	3	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	1	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	2	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	4	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	3	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	1	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	2	0	4	1	0	2.57	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	1	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	1	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 238
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	59	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
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	41				
				?	5						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: JOSLYN, JENNIFE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 239
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	5	11	24	14	3.63	1441/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	12	25	16	3.81	1319/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	5	9	23	17	3.71	1195/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	9	5	15	9	7	3.00	1532/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	4	19	15	12	3.70	1104/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	34	3	4	9	3	4	3.04	1405/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	7	11	16	21	3.82	1237/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	2	1	7	45	4.73	928/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	4	1	3	15	18	3	3.47	1331/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	2	6	12	18	4.21	1126/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	1	6	10	26	4.42	1264/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	3	8	11	11	3.91	1182/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	3	1	8	10	12	3.79	1219/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	8	1	4	4	6	13	3.93	709/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	6	7	10	17	14	3.48	1117/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	8	9	8	28	4.00	983/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	7	6	16	13	11	3.28	1262/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	11	8	12	11	11	3.06	837/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.06	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	3	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	1	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	3	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	1	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	2	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	4	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	3	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	1	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	2	0	4	1	0	2.57	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	1	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	1	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: JOSLYN, JENNIFE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 239
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	59	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
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	41				
				?	5						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 240
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	5	11	24	14	3.63	1441/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	12	25	16	3.81	1319/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	5	9	23	17	3.71	1195/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	9	5	15	9	7	3.00	1532/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	4	19	15	12	3.70	1104/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	34	3	4	9	3	4	3.04	1405/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	7	11	16	21	3.82	1237/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	2	1	7	45	4.73	928/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	4	0	0	12	23	5	3.83	1117/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	5	13	20	4.39	957/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	3	13	26	4.47	1222/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	2	1	7	14	11	3.89	1193/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	2	2	1	7	12	11	3.88	1177/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	8	1	4	4	7	12	3.89	738/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	6	7	10	17	14	3.48	1117/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	8	9	8	28	4.00	983/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	7	6	16	13	11	3.28	1262/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	11	8	12	11	11	3.06	837/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.06	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	3	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	1	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	3	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	1	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	2	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	4	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	3	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	1	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	2	0	4	1	0	2.57	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	1	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	1	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 240
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	59	Non-major	58
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
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	41				
				?	5						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 241
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	5	18	25	9	3.58	1466/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	5	16	20	17	3.84	1300/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	5	13	19	17	3.64	1228/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	5	8	8	16	12	3.45	1431/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	5	6	12	9	16	3.52	1229/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	6	5	6	8	6	3.10	1394/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	7	11	15	24	3.93	1135/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	1	13	42	4.67	1001/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	1	0	3	21	13	4.18	737/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	4	8	43	4.60	696/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	5	50	4.81	776/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	7	17	34	4.47	648/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	2	3	17	31	4.45	703/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	3	5	14	30	4.30	421/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	11	10	9	13	13	3.13	1252/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	5	9	14	24	3.93	1048/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	7	5	12	17	12	3.42	1221/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	11	4	4	20	14	3.42	764/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	3	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 241
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	2	A	15	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	60
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	44				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 242
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	5	18	25	9	3.58	1466/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	5	16	20	17	3.84	1300/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	5	13	19	17	3.64	1228/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	5	8	8	16	12	3.45	1431/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	5	6	12	9	16	3.52	1229/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	6	5	6	8	6	3.10	1394/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	7	11	15	24	3.93	1135/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	1	13	42	4.67	1001/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	2	2	19	14	1	3.26	1416/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	2	3	8	13	19	3.98	1261/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	2	6	13	27	4.29	1345/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	3	4	10	15	13	3.69	1286/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	3	3	6	1	11	16	3.84	1198/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	5	3	7	6	14	9	3.49	989/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	11	10	9	13	13	3.13	1252/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	5	9	14	24	3.93	1048/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	7	5	12	17	12	3.42	1221/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	11	4	4	20	14	3.42	764/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	3	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 242
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	2	A	15	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	60
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	44				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: JOSLYN, JENNIFE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 243
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	5	18	25	9	3.58	1466/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	5	16	20	17	3.84	1300/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	5	13	19	17	3.64	1228/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	5	8	8	16	12	3.45	1431/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	5	6	12	9	16	3.52	1229/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	6	5	6	8	6	3.10	1394/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	7	11	15	24	3.93	1135/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	1	13	42	4.67	1001/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	2	1	5	16	14	1	3.24	1423/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	6	3	4	9	17	3.72	1381/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	2	3	9	11	23	4.04	1407/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	4	10	11	16	3.88	1193/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	2	3	4	4	9	13	3.76	1237/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	7	3	7	3	9	9	3.45	1006/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	11	10	9	13	13	3.13	1252/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	5	9	14	24	3.93	1048/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	7	5	12	17	12	3.42	1221/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	11	4	4	20	14	3.42	764/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	3	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: JOSLYN, JENNIFE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 243
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	2	A	15	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	60
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	44				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 244
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	5	18	25	9	3.58	1466/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	5	16	20	17	3.84	1300/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	5	13	19	17	3.64	1228/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	5	8	8	16	12	3.45	1431/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	5	6	12	9	16	3.52	1229/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	6	5	6	8	6	3.10	1394/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	7	11	15	24	3.93	1135/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	1	13	42	4.67	1001/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	3	0	0	7	20	9	4.06	859/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	3	2	4	9	22	4.13	1189/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	1	7	14	26	4.29	1345/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	1	10	8	22	4.17	973/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	2	1	4	2	8	19	4.18	963/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	6	2	6	3	9	13	3.76	838/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	11	10	9	13	13	3.13	1252/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	5	9	14	24	3.93	1048/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	7	5	12	17	12	3.42	1221/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	11	4	4	20	14	3.42	764/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.42	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	52	3	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 244
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	2	A	15	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	60
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	44				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 245
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	13	18	15	3.67	1416/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	9	24	14	3.78	1344/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	5	7	21	18	3.91	1086/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	7	7	16	9	3.56	1382/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	2	1	11	13	17	3.95	842/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	4	1	8	12	3	3.32	1310/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	2	11	16	21	4.06	1010/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	4	0	2	2	6	38	4.67	1001/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	3	1	3	7	17	13	3.93	1022/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.51	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	12	35	4.49	821/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	10	39	4.60	1115/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	0	6	12	29	4.22	928/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	2	4	13	28	4.22	927/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	3	10	13	23	4.02	618/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	9	20	16	3.75	965/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	2	8	12	27	4.12	927/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.12	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	8	7	10	11	14	3.32	1251/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	7	3	7	10	21	3.73	629/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 245
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	8	A	15	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	42				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 246
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	4	13	18	15	3.67	1416/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	9	24	14	3.78	1344/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	5	7	21	18	3.91	1086/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	7	7	16	9	3.56	1382/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	2	1	11	13	17	3.95	842/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	4	1	8	12	3	3.32	1310/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	2	11	16	21	4.06	1010/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	4	0	2	2	6	38	4.67	1001/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	4	1	5	15	16	0	3.24	1423/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.51	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	2	1	3	12	19	4.22	1126/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	3	0	5	2	31	4.41	1264/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	4	3	7	12	11	3.62	1304/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	1	2	7	5	5	12	3.58	1303/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	6	2	5	5	10	10	3.66	900/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	9	20	16	3.75	965/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	2	8	12	27	4.12	927/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.12	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	8	7	10	11	14	3.32	1251/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	7	3	7	10	21	3.73	629/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 246
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 8	A 15	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 14	General 0	Under-grad 53 Non-major 54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 2		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 8	F 1	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other 42	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: JOSLYN, JENNIFE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 247
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	13	18	15	3.67	1416/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	9	24	14	3.78	1344/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	5	7	21	18	3.91	1086/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	7	7	16	9	3.56	1382/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	2	1	11	13	17	3.95	842/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	4	1	8	12	3	3.32	1310/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	2	11	16	21	4.06	1010/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	4	0	2	2	6	38	4.67	1001/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	3	3	3	14	17	0	3.22	1434/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.51	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	1	5	10	11	4.04	1226/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	3	3	11	17	4.14	1388/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	4	3	6	10	9	3.53	1335/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	2	2	4	5	8	7	3.54	1318/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	9	2	4	4	6	6	3.45	1006/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	9	20	16	3.75	965/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	2	8	12	27	4.12	927/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.12	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	8	7	10	11	14	3.32	1251/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	7	3	7	10	21	3.73	629/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: JOSLYN, JENNIFE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 247
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	8	A	15	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	42				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 248
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	4	13	18	15	3.67	1416/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	9	24	14	3.78	1344/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	5	7	21	18	3.91	1086/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	7	7	16	9	3.56	1382/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	2	1	11	13	17	3.95	842/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	25	4	1	8	12	3	3.32	1310/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	2	11	16	21	4.06	1010/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	4	0	2	2	6	38	4.67	1001/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	5	0	2	11	19	3	3.66	1239/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.51	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	1	1	4	10	11	4.07	1213/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	1	2	3	9	20	4.29	1345/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	2	3	6	12	9	3.72	1276/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	1	1	4	4	9	8	3.73	1245/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	9	2	4	4	6	6	3.45	1006/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	9	20	16	3.75	965/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	2	8	12	27	4.12	927/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.12	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	8	7	10	11	14	3.32	1251/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	7	3	7	10	21	3.73	629/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	51	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0105
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 248
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	8	A	15	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	14	General	0	Under-grad	53	Non-major	54
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	42				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 249
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	14	15	14	3.69	1397/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	8	11	15	15	3.76	1357/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	24	13	3.90	1092/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	5	3	7	16	3	3.26	1482/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	5	9	14	13	3.72	1081/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	2	5	8	5	6	3.31	1323/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	11	12	21	4.02	1030/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	7	39	4.79	840/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	0	1	4	17	7	4.03	871/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	11	36	4.73	510/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	7	39	4.77	855/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	8	14	21	4.11	1025/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.01	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	0	7	14	21	4.04	1057/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	2	3	16	21	4.11	569/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	9	19	13	3.71	1002/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	4	9	10	25	4.17	887/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	3	12	17	13	3.71	1112/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	3	4	10	12	16	3.76	610/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.76	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 249
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	4	A	14	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	48	Non-major	48
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 250
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	14	15	14	3.69	1397/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	8	11	15	15	3.76	1357/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	24	13	3.90	1092/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	5	3	7	16	3	3.26	1482/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	5	9	14	13	3.72	1081/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	2	5	8	5	6	3.31	1323/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	11	12	21	4.02	1030/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	7	39	4.79	840/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	3	1	10	11	2	3.30	1405/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	1	4	7	17	4.38	978/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	1	0	1	10	20	4.50	1188/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	1	12	8	9	3.74	1264/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.01	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	4	7	10	8	3.50	1328/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	5	2	3	4	8	9	3.73	851/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	9	19	13	3.71	1002/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	4	9	10	25	4.17	887/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	3	12	17	13	3.71	1112/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	3	4	10	12	16	3.76	610/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.76	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 250
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	4	A	14	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	48	Non-major	48
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 251
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	14	15	14	3.69	1397/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	8	11	15	15	3.76	1357/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	24	13	3.90	1092/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	5	3	7	16	3	3.26	1482/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	5	9	14	13	3.72	1081/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	2	5	8	5	6	3.31	1323/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	11	12	21	4.02	1030/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	7	39	4.79	840/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	4	0	0	10	12	1	3.61	1270/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	933/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	1	1	2	11	14	4.24	1360/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	1059/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.01	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	3	4	8	10	3.88	1171/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	5	2	1	4	7	7	3.76	832/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	9	19	13	3.71	1002/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	4	9	10	25	4.17	887/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	3	12	17	13	3.71	1112/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	3	4	10	12	16	3.76	610/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.76	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 251
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	4	A	14	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	48	Non-major	48
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 252
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	14	15	14	3.69	1397/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	8	11	15	15	3.76	1357/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	24	13	3.90	1092/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	5	3	7	16	3	3.26	1482/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	5	9	14	13	3.72	1081/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	2	5	8	5	6	3.31	1323/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	11	12	21	4.02	1030/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	7	39	4.79	840/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	4	0	0	9	12	1	3.64	1251/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	877/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	3	11	13	4.37	1292/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	1	5	7	11	4.17	973/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.01	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	7	7	9	3.88	1171/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	5	2	1	4	7	6	3.70	871/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	9	19	13	3.71	1002/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	4	9	10	25	4.17	887/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	3	12	17	13	3.71	1112/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	3	4	10	12	16	3.76	610/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.76	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	48	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 252
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	4	A	14	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	48	Non-major	48
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 253
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	9	15	21	13	3.57	1471/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	4	18	21	12	3.60	1444/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	16	24	16	3.88	1099/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	4	3	20	19	2	3.25	1484/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	2	4	14	15	14	3.71	1092/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	34	5	4	11	3	2	2.72	1465/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	2.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	3	4	11	15	24	3.93	1148/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	0	9	47	4.77	855/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	1	7	25	11	3.98	939/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	4	11	42	4.56	745/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	1	12	46	4.66	1047/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.02	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	7	18	35	4.43	700/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	10	18	28	4.11	1019/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	2	12	17	21	3.93	709/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	11	12	16	11	10	2.95	1292/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	2.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	9	12	14	20	3.63	1187/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	9	8	19	13	10	3.12	1304/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.12	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	7	8	14	13	12	3.28	801/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.28	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	6	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	4	0	2	1	1	2.38	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	1	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	1	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	2	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	1	3	0	0	1	2.40	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	2	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	1	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	1	4	0	1	0	1	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 253
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	2	A	18	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	61	Non-major	61
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	45				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 254
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	9	15	21	13	3.57	1471/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	4	18	21	12	3.60	1444/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	16	24	16	3.88	1099/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	4	3	20	19	2	3.25	1484/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	2	4	14	15	14	3.71	1092/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	34	5	4	11	3	2	2.72	1465/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	2.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	3	4	11	15	24	3.93	1148/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	0	9	47	4.77	855/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	6	5	23	12	1	2.94	1502/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	2	3	10	16	22	4.00	1237/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	2	4	6	14	26	4.12	1394/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.02	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	4	6	16	17	9	3.40	1384/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	10	4	15	10	11	3.16	1419/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	4	5	4	13	12	11	3.44	1012/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	11	12	16	11	10	2.95	1292/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	2.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	9	12	14	20	3.63	1187/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	9	8	19	13	10	3.12	1304/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.12	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	7	8	14	13	12	3.28	801/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.28	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	6	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	4	0	2	1	1	2.38	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	1	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	1	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	2	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	1	3	0	0	1	2.40	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	2	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	1	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	1	4	0	1	0	1	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 254
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	2	A	18	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	61	Non-major	61
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	45				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: FEDOROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 255
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	9	15	21	13	3.57	1471/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	4	18	21	12	3.60	1444/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	16	24	16	3.88	1099/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	4	3	20	19	2	3.25	1484/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	2	4	14	15	14	3.71	1092/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	34	5	4	11	3	2	2.72	1465/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	2.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	3	4	11	15	24	3.93	1148/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	0	9	47	4.77	855/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	7	2	3	21	11	1	3.16	1450/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	4	4	16	10	12	3.48	1425/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	2	5	9	16	12	3.70	1474/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.02	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	2	3	19	12	9	3.51	1343/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	1	6	6	15	7	10	3.20	1411/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	10	3	4	14	7	5	3.21	1117/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	11	12	16	11	10	2.95	1292/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	2.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	9	12	14	20	3.63	1187/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	9	8	19	13	10	3.12	1304/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.12	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	7	8	14	13	12	3.28	801/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.28	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	6	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	4	0	2	1	1	2.38	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	1	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	1	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	2	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	1	3	0	0	1	2.40	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	2	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	1	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	1	4	0	1	0	1	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: FEDOROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 255
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	2	A	18	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	61	Non-major	61
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	45				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 256
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	9	15	21	13	3.57	1471/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	4	18	21	12	3.60	1444/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	16	24	16	3.88	1099/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	4	3	20	19	2	3.25	1484/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	2	4	14	15	14	3.71	1092/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	34	5	4	11	3	2	2.72	1465/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	2.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	3	4	11	15	24	3.93	1148/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	1	0	0	9	47	4.77	855/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	5	1	4	19	13	1	3.24	1427/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	5	4	13	11	12	3.47	1428/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	3	6	8	15	12	3.61	1483/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.02	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	2	2	17	15	8	3.57	1324/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	6	4	15	8	9	3.24	1405/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	10	3	4	13	7	3	3.10	1149/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	11	12	16	11	10	2.95	1292/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	2.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	4	9	12	14	20	3.63	1187/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	9	8	19	13	10	3.12	1304/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.12	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	7	8	14	13	12	3.28	801/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.28	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	6	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	4	0	2	1	1	2.38	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	2	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	1	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	54	2	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	2	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	2	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	1	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	2	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	1	3	0	0	1	2.40	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	2	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	1	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	54	1	4	0	1	0	1	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0202
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 256
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	2	A	18	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	61	Non-major	61
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	45				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 69
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 257
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	15	16	17	3.78	1345/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	18	10	20	3.78	1344/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	10	11	12	18	3.59	1250/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	1	10	10	9	8	3.34	1462/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.34	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	3	13	17	10	3.67	1136/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	2	7	12	5	5	3.13	1385/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	6	9	19	17	3.87	1206/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	8	44	4.79	825/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	1	2	8	14	9	3.82	1117/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	4	11	36	4.49	821/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	8	42	4.75	890/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	2	7	14	26	4.12	1016/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	3	6	10	30	4.24	912/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	4	2	9	11	25	4.00	623/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	6	10	14	16	3.54	1096/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	4	12	12	21	3.90	1065/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	10	12	13	11	3.25	1270/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	6	3	14	10	15	3.52	716/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.52	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 69
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 257
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	10	General	2	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
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	40				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 69
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 258
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	15	16	17	3.78	1345/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	18	10	20	3.78	1344/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	10	11	12	18	3.59	1250/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	1	10	10	9	8	3.34	1462/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.34	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	3	13	17	10	3.67	1136/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	2	7	12	5	5	3.13	1385/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	6	9	19	17	3.87	1206/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	8	44	4.79	825/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	5	6	15	8	0	2.76	1529/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	4	0	3	14	19	4.10	1203/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	4	2	4	12	17	3.92	1438/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	8	2	14	6	8	3.11	1448/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	1	7	2	12	6	10	3.27	1398/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	1	9	6	8	4	10	3.00	1158/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	6	10	14	16	3.54	1096/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	4	12	12	21	3.90	1065/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	10	12	13	11	3.25	1270/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	6	3	14	10	15	3.52	716/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.52	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 69
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 258
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	10	General	2	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
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	40				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 69
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 259
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	15	16	17	3.78	1345/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	18	10	20	3.78	1344/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	10	11	12	18	3.59	1250/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	1	10	10	9	8	3.34	1462/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.34	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	3	13	17	10	3.67	1136/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	2	7	12	5	5	3.13	1385/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	6	9	19	17	3.87	1206/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	8	44	4.79	825/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	1	0	2	11	13	3	3.59	1279/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	1	0	5	12	15	4.21	1126/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	1	3	13	17	4.35	1305/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	1	1	5	9	17	4.21	928/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	3	1	6	8	15	3.94	1135/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	2	5	3	5	5	11	3.48	989/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	6	10	14	16	3.54	1096/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	4	12	12	21	3.90	1065/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	10	12	13	11	3.25	1270/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	6	3	14	10	15	3.52	716/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.52	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 69
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 259
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	10	General	2	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
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	40				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 69
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 260
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	4	15	16	17	3.78	1345/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	18	10	20	3.78	1344/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	10	11	12	18	3.59	1250/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	1	10	10	9	8	3.34	1462/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.34	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	3	13	17	10	3.67	1136/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	2	7	12	5	5	3.13	1385/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	6	9	19	17	3.87	1206/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	8	44	4.79	825/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	2	0	0	9	14	6	3.90	1063/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	1	0	5	12	15	4.21	1126/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	1	4	12	17	4.32	1325/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	2	4	9	18	4.30	833/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	1	7	8	15	4.00	1077/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	2	6	2	5	5	11	3.45	1012/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	6	10	14	16	3.54	1096/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	4	12	12	21	3.90	1065/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	10	12	13	11	3.25	1270/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	6	3	14	10	15	3.52	716/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.52	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	51	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	51	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	51	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	52	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	52	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	52	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0203
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 69
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 260
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	10	General	2	Under-grad	54	Non-major	52
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	40				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 261
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	7	24	25	12	3.62	1447/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	19	21	24	3.94	1193/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	3	15	20	25	3.92	1063/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	26	6	7	13	8	6	3.03	1529/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	3	2	15	14	22	3.89	918/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	41	2	3	10	6	6	3.41	1259/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	5	2	13	17	29	3.95	1109/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	9	57	4.86	721/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	0	6	32	17	4.20	725/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	11	54	4.74	491/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	11	55	4.78	855/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	7	23	36	4.37	768/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	5	15	45	4.56	568/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	4	13	17	28	4.06	595/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	13	5	20	16	14	3.19	1225/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	9	11	17	9	22	3.35	1260/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	22	8	18	10	9	2.64	1366/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	2.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	16	9	13	13	12	2.94	869/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	2.94	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	56	6	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	1	2	2	3	0	2.88	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	62	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	65	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	65	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	65	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	65	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 261
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	68	Non-major	66
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	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	52				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 262
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	7	24	25	12	3.62	1447/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	19	21	24	3.94	1193/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	3	15	20	25	3.92	1063/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	26	6	7	13	8	6	3.03	1529/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	3	2	15	14	22	3.89	918/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	41	2	3	10	6	6	3.41	1259/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	5	2	13	17	29	3.95	1109/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	9	57	4.86	721/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	3	11	24	12	1	2.94	1498/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	4	1	10	9	31	4.13	1189/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	4	6	12	32	4.27	1349/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	4	4	15	15	13	3.57	1324/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	7	10	9	8	16	3.32	1388/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	9	5	3	10	12	13	3.58	938/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	13	5	20	16	14	3.19	1225/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	9	11	17	9	22	3.35	1260/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	22	8	18	10	9	2.64	1366/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	2.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	16	9	13	13	12	2.94	869/958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	2.94	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	56	6	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	1	2	2	3	0	2.88	****/240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	62	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	65	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	65	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	65	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	65	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 262
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	68	Non-major	66
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	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	52				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: JOSLYN, JENNIFE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 263
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	7	24	25	12	3.62	1447/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	19	21	24	3.94	1193/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	3	15	20	25	3.92	1063/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	26	6	7	13	8	6	3.03	1529/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	3	2	15	14	22	3.89	918/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	41	2	3	10	6	6	3.41	1259/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	5	2	13	17	29	3.95	1109/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	9	57	4.86	721/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	4	7	4	18	14	0	2.91	1513/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	9	5	6	6	13	3.23	1462/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	4	0	10	11	21	3.98	1423/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	8	5	9	13	5	3.05	1450/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	2	8	7	5	6	10	3.08	1434/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	17	4	1	8	3	6	3.27	1093/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	13	5	20	16	14	3.19	1225/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	9	11	17	9	22	3.35	1260/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	22	8	18	10	9	2.64	1366/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	2.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	16	9	13	13	12	2.94	869/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	2.94	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	56	6	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	1	2	2	3	0	2.88	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	62	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	65	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	65	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	65	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	65	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: JOSLYN, JENNIFE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 263
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	68	Non-major	66
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	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	52				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: FEDOROWSKI, JEN (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 264
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	7	24	25	12	3.62	1447/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	19	21	24	3.94	1193/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	3	15	20	25	3.92	1063/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	26	6	7	13	8	6	3.03	1529/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	3	2	15	14	22	3.89	918/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	41	2	3	10	6	6	3.41	1259/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	5	2	13	17	29	3.95	1109/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	9	57	4.86	721/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	5	5	4	17	15	1	3.07	1467/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	12	2	7	8	11	3.10	1476/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	8	2	9	6	21	3.65	1479/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	12	2	10	10	5	2.85	1479/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	4	5	7	5	7	9	3.24	1403/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	18	2	4	5	3	6	3.35	1058/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	13	5	20	16	14	3.19	1225/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	9	11	17	9	22	3.35	1260/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	22	8	18	10	9	2.64	1366/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	2.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	16	9	13	13	12	2.94	869/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	2.94	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	56	6	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	1	2	2	3	0	2.88	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	62	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	65	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	65	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	65	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	65	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	65	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0204
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: FEDOROWSKI, JEN (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 264
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	68	Non-major	66
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	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	52				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 265
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	5	8	26	14	3.77	1352/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	10	29	14	3.96	1158/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	13	21	18	3.89	1092/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	2	5	12	20	7	3.54	1390/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	5	3	6	23	14	3.75	1058/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	20	2	4	12	9	6	3.39	1265/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	11	15	24	4.02	1037/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	2	1	3	2	7	35	4.50	1135/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	1	0	10	18	9	3.89	1063/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	5	5	40	4.58	720/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	7	4	41	4.65	1047/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	11	11	28	4.25	886/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	6	8	34	4.46	690/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	1	2	11	15	18	4.00	623/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	2	10	15	18	3.73	987/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	11	14	23	4.10	940/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	6	14	10	16	3.61	1152/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	5	4	9	10	18	3.70	646/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 265
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	4	A	20	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	57	Non-major	56
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	45				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 266
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	5	8	26	14	3.77	1352/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	10	29	14	3.96	1158/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	13	21	18	3.89	1092/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	2	5	12	20	7	3.54	1390/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	5	3	6	23	14	3.75	1058/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	20	2	4	12	9	6	3.39	1265/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	11	15	24	4.02	1037/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	2	1	3	2	7	35	4.50	1135/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	1	0	2	14	13	4	3.58	1284/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	1	5	10	19	4.34	1010/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	2	5	7	22	4.36	1299/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	2	6	14	11	4.03	1065/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	2	3	6	8	10	3.72	1250/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	4	1	2	4	10	9	3.92	709/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	2	10	15	18	3.73	987/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	11	14	23	4.10	940/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	6	14	10	16	3.61	1152/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	5	4	9	10	18	3.70	646/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 266
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	4	A	20	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	57	Non-major	56
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	45				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: JOSLYN, JENNIFE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 267
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	5	8	26	14	3.77	1352/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	10	29	14	3.96	1158/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	13	21	18	3.89	1092/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	2	5	12	20	7	3.54	1390/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	5	3	6	23	14	3.75	1058/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	20	2	4	12	9	6	3.39	1265/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	11	15	24	4.02	1037/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	2	1	3	2	7	35	4.50	1135/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	3	1	1	10	17	2	3.58	1279/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	2	2	6	1	15	3.96	1269/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	2	7	1	21	4.32	1325/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	0	2	8	6	9	3.88	1193/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	4	4	6	8	3.70	1262/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	4	1	2	7	6	5	3.57	943/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	2	10	15	18	3.73	987/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	11	14	23	4.10	940/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	6	14	10	16	3.61	1152/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	5	4	9	10	18	3.70	646/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: JOSLYN, JENNIFE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 267
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	4	A	20	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	57	Non-major	56
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	45				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 268
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	5	8	26	14	3.77	1352/1639	3.67	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	10	29	14	3.96	1158/1639	3.84	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	13	21	18	3.89	1092/1397	3.78	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	2	5	12	20	7	3.54	1390/1583	3.30	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	5	3	6	23	14	3.75	1058/1532	3.71	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	20	2	4	12	9	6	3.39	1265/1504	3.12	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	11	15	24	4.02	1037/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	2	1	3	2	7	35	4.50	1135/1635	4.72	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	3	0	1	7	16	7	3.94	1005/1579	3.56	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	2	2	4	0	18	4.15	1169/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	3	3	2	23	4.45	1230/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	0	1	5	4	15	4.32	811/1517	3.90	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	2	4	1	7	9	3.74	1245/1550	3.81	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	3	1	1	6	5	9	3.91	731/1295	3.68	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	6	2	10	15	18	3.73	987/1398	3.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	11	14	23	4.10	940/1391	3.86	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	3	6	14	10	16	3.61	1152/1388	3.30	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	5	4	9	10	18	3.70	646/ 958	3.43	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	54	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 101 0205
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 268
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	4	A	20	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	57	Non-major	56
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	45				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 269
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	0	3	3.27	1560/1639	3.39	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1375/1639	4.11	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	4	4	4.00	973/1397	4.25	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1582/1583	2.88	3.70	4.19	4.01	1.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1360/1532	3.50	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1504	1.70	3.54	4.05	3.78	1.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	0	1	5	3.50	1399/1612	3.75	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1135/1635	4.75	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1071/1579	3.37	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	807/1518	4.04	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1033/1520	4.03	4.35	4.70	4.61	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1083/1517	3.41	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1019/1550	3.18	3.87	4.22	4.17	2.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	313/1295	3.32	3.69	3.94	3.84	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	1	1	1	2.00	1384/1398	2.58	3.50	4.07	3.85	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	4	1	1	2	3	2.91	1347/1391	3.54	3.91	4.30	4.07	2.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	4	2	1	2	2.73	1359/1388	2.61	3.45	4.28	4.01	2.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	7	0	1	1	0	1.56	947/ 958	2.78	3.45	3.93	3.71	1.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 3	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 270
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	0	3	3.27	1560/1639	3.39	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1375/1639	4.11	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	4	4	4.00	973/1397	4.25	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1582/1583	2.88	3.70	4.19	4.01	1.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1360/1532	3.50	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1504	1.70	3.54	4.05	3.78	1.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	0	1	5	3.50	1399/1612	3.75	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1135/1635	4.75	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	2	3	2	0	2.75	1531/1579	3.37	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	1	0	5	3.67	1392/1518	4.04	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	1465/1520	4.03	4.35	4.70	4.61	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	2	3	0	2.78	1485/1517	3.41	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	4	0	1	1	2.38	1502/1550	3.18	3.87	4.22	4.17	2.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	0	1	2	3	3.22	1113/1295	3.32	3.69	3.94	3.84	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	1	1	1	2.00	1384/1398	2.58	3.50	4.07	3.85	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	4	1	1	2	3	2.91	1347/1391	3.54	3.91	4.30	4.07	2.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	4	2	1	2	2.73	1359/1388	2.61	3.45	4.28	4.01	2.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	7	0	1	1	0	1.56	947/ 958	2.78	3.45	3.93	3.71	1.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 3	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 271
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	0	3	3.27	1560/1639	3.39	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1375/1639	4.11	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	4	4	4.00	973/1397	4.25	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1582/1583	2.88	3.70	4.19	4.01	1.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1360/1532	3.50	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1504	1.70	3.54	4.05	3.78	1.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	0	1	5	3.50	1399/1612	3.75	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1135/1635	4.75	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1294/1579	3.37	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	1	0	1	3	3.29	1455/1518	4.04	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1453/1520	4.03	4.35	4.70	4.61	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	3	2	0	2.86	1478/1517	3.41	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	2	2	0	0	1	2.20	1512/1550	3.18	3.87	4.22	4.17	2.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	1273/1295	3.32	3.69	3.94	3.84	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	1	1	1	2.00	1384/1398	2.58	3.50	4.07	3.85	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	4	1	1	2	3	2.91	1347/1391	3.54	3.91	4.30	4.07	2.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	4	2	1	2	2.73	1359/1388	2.61	3.45	4.28	4.01	2.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	7	0	1	1	0	1.56	947/ 958	2.78	3.45	3.93	3.71	1.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 3	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 11 Non-major 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR
 Instructor: FEDOROWSKI, JEN (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 272
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	5	0	3	3.27	1560/1639	3.39	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1375/1639	4.11	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	4	4	4.00	973/1397	4.25	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1582/1583	2.88	3.70	4.19	4.01	1.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1360/1532	3.50	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1504	1.70	3.54	4.05	3.78	1.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	0	1	5	3.50	1399/1612	3.75	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1135/1635	4.75	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	1354/1579	3.37	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.41	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	1	0	1	3	3.29	1455/1518	4.04	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1492/1520	4.03	4.35	4.70	4.61	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	2	2	0	2.71	1493/1517	3.41	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	2	2	0	0	1	2.20	1512/1550	3.18	3.87	4.22	4.17	2.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	1273/1295	3.32	3.69	3.94	3.84	2.92	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	1	1	1	2.00	1384/1398	2.58	3.50	4.07	3.85	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	4	1	1	2	3	2.91	1347/1391	3.54	3.91	4.30	4.07	2.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	4	2	1	2	2.73	1359/1388	2.61	3.45	4.28	4.01	2.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	7	0	1	1	0	1.56	947/ 958	2.78	3.45	3.93	3.71	1.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 3	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 273
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1497/1639	3.39	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1639	4.11	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1397	4.25	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1010/1583	2.88	3.70	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1046/1532	3.50	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1486/1504	1.70	3.54	4.05	3.78	2.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1044/1612	3.75	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	4.75	4.76	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	889/1579	3.37	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1518	4.04	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1033/1520	4.03	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1517	3.41	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	457/1550	3.18	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	265/1295	3.32	3.69	3.94	3.84	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1237/1398	2.58	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	887/1391	3.54	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1371/1388	2.61	3.45	4.28	4.01	2.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	456/ 958	2.78	3.45	3.93	3.71	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 274
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1497/1639	3.39	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1639	4.11	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1397	4.25	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1010/1583	2.88	3.70	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1046/1532	3.50	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1486/1504	1.70	3.54	4.05	3.78	2.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1044/1612	3.75	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	4.75	4.76	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1531/1579	3.37	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	807/1518	4.04	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1188/1520	4.03	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1424/1517	3.41	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1328/1550	3.18	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	838/1295	3.32	3.69	3.94	3.84	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1237/1398	2.58	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	887/1391	3.54	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1371/1388	2.61	3.45	4.28	4.01	2.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	456/ 958	2.78	3.45	3.93	3.71	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 275
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1497/1639	3.39	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1639	4.11	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1397	4.25	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1010/1583	2.88	3.70	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1046/1532	3.50	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1486/1504	1.70	3.54	4.05	3.78	2.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1044/1612	3.75	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	4.75	4.76	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1270/1579	3.37	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.34	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1478/1520	4.03	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1517	3.41	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1550	3.18	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1237/1398	2.58	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	887/1391	3.54	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1371/1388	2.61	3.45	4.28	4.01	2.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	456/ 958	2.78	3.45	3.93	3.71	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 101H 0201
 Title PRIN OF CHEM I - HONOR
 Instructor: FEDOROWSKI, JEN (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 276
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1497/1639	3.39	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1639	4.11	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1397	4.25	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1010/1583	2.88	3.70	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1046/1532	3.50	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1486/1504	1.70	3.54	4.05	3.78	2.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1044/1612	3.75	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	4.75	4.76	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.37	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.34	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1478/1520	4.03	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1517	3.41	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1550	3.18	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1237/1398	2.58	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	887/1391	3.54	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1371/1388	2.61	3.45	4.28	4.01	2.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	456/ 958	2.78	3.45	3.93	3.71	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 277
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	5	14	17	11	3.61	1447/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	9	21	15	3.92	1244/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	3	12	11	19	3.89	1092/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	3	4	14	10	3.91	1158/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	3	6	13	20	4.12	692/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	1	1	5	7	4	3.67	1116/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	9	16	18	4.00	1044/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	27	18	4.37	1265/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	1	1	7	24	3	3.75	1170/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	15	29	4.52	782/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	13	31	4.57	1136/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	8	18	19	4.15	990/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	6	15	19	3.91	1152/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	5	5	14	15	3.85	768/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	6	12	13	11	3.46	1134/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	8	11	24	4.20	863/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	6	9	17	10	3.50	1185/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	5	1	8	11	18	3.84	563/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.84	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 16			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C 12	General 0	Under-grad 49	Non-major 48
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 41		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 278
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	5	14	17	11	3.61	1447/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	9	21	15	3.92	1244/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	3	12	11	19	3.89	1092/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	3	4	14	10	3.91	1158/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	3	6	13	20	4.12	692/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	1	1	5	7	4	3.67	1116/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	9	16	18	4.00	1044/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	27	18	4.37	1265/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	1	3	10	18	2	3.50	1318/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	835/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	2	3	5	15	4.32	1325/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	2	1	4	11	6	3.75	1260/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	4	1	5	7	4	3.29	1396/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	5	1	1	6	4	6	3.72	858/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	6	12	13	11	3.46	1134/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	8	11	24	4.20	863/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	6	9	17	10	3.50	1185/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	5	1	8	11	18	3.84	563/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.84	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 16			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C 12	General 0	Under-grad 49	Non-major 48
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 41		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: JOSLYN, JENNIFE (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 279
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	5	14	17	11	3.61	1447/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	9	21	15	3.92	1244/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	3	12	11	19	3.89	1092/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	3	4	14	10	3.91	1158/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	3	6	13	20	4.12	692/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	1	1	5	7	4	3.67	1116/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	9	16	18	4.00	1044/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	27	18	4.37	1265/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	2	3	17	10	1	3.15	1450/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	37	0	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	****/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	1454/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	1	2	5	7	2	3.41	1380/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	3	2	4	4	1	2.86	1468/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	6	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	****/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	6	12	13	11	3.46	1134/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	8	11	24	4.20	863/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	6	9	17	10	3.50	1185/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	5	1	8	11	18	3.84	563/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.84	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 16			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C 12	General 0	Under-grad 49	Non-major 48
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 41		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0101
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 280
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	5	14	17	11	3.61	1447/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	9	21	15	3.92	1244/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	3	12	11	19	3.89	1092/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	1	3	4	14	10	3.91	1158/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	3	6	13	20	4.12	692/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	29	1	1	5	7	4	3.67	1116/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	9	16	18	4.00	1044/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	27	18	4.37	1265/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	1	4	21	5	3.97	955/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	37	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	****/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	0	2	1	2	12	4.41	1264/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	907/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	2	2	2	4	4	3.43	1360/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	34	6	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	****/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	6	12	13	11	3.46	1134/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	8	11	24	4.20	863/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	6	9	17	10	3.50	1185/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	5	1	8	11	18	3.84	563/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.84	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 16			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C 12	General 0	Under-grad 49	Non-major 48
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 41		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 281
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	17	26	11	3.72	1378/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	15	25	15	3.86	1287/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	3	1	10	22	19	3.96	1018/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	2	3	11	12	12	3.72	1282/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	10	4	3	8	17	14	3.74	1069/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	29	5	2	8	10	2	3.07	1398/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	4	12	19	18	3.91	1175/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	1	38	15	4.26	1350/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	2	1	7	23	12	3.93	1005/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	14	37	4.53	782/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	3	11	42	4.63	1074/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	8	15	30	4.21	928/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	6	2	6	18	24	3.93	1144/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	4	7	18	22	4.08	590/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	13	3	8	18	11	3.21	1222/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	5	3	10	12	23	3.85	1100/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	6	16	11	15	3.52	1182/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	9	2	8	14	14	3.47	742/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 281
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	22						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	59	Non-major	59
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	42				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 282
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	17	26	11	3.72	1378/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	15	25	15	3.86	1287/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	3	1	10	22	19	3.96	1018/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	2	3	11	12	12	3.72	1282/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	10	4	3	8	17	14	3.74	1069/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	29	5	2	8	10	2	3.07	1398/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	4	12	19	18	3.91	1175/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	1	38	15	4.26	1350/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	9	5	18	8	2	2.74	1533/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	4	2	5	8	14	3.79	1357/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	1	5	4	8	16	3.97	1423/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	5	6	5	9	6	3.16	1439/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	2	8	3	3	5	7	3.00	1440/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	5	2	3	6	6	7	3.54	958/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	13	3	8	18	11	3.21	1222/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	5	3	10	12	23	3.85	1100/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	6	16	11	15	3.52	1182/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	9	2	8	14	14	3.47	742/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 282
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	22						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	59	Non-major	59
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	42				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: FEDOROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 283
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	17	26	11	3.72	1378/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	15	25	15	3.86	1287/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	3	1	10	22	19	3.96	1018/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	2	3	11	12	12	3.72	1282/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	10	4	3	8	17	14	3.74	1069/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	29	5	2	8	10	2	3.07	1398/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	4	12	19	18	3.91	1175/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	1	38	15	4.26	1350/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	5	4	13	15	1	3.08	1467/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	3	0	9	5	6	3.48	1425/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	35	0	2	4	7	6	5	3.33	1504/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	38	0	0	3	8	6	4	3.52	1339/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	42	0	2	2	6	4	3	3.24	1405/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	42	2	2	2	7	2	2	3.00	1158/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	13	3	8	18	11	3.21	1222/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	5	3	10	12	23	3.85	1100/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	6	16	11	15	3.52	1182/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	9	2	8	14	14	3.47	742/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: FEDOROWSKI, JEN (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 283
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	22						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	59	Non-major	59
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	42				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 284
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	17	26	11	3.72	1378/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	15	25	15	3.86	1287/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	3	1	10	22	19	3.96	1018/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	2	3	11	12	12	3.72	1282/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	10	4	3	8	17	14	3.74	1069/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	29	5	2	8	10	2	3.07	1398/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	4	12	19	18	3.91	1175/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	1	38	15	4.26	1350/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	4	2	7	19	7	3.59	1279/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	36	0	1	0	6	6	10	4.04	1223/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	35	0	0	2	4	6	12	4.17	1383/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	36	0	1	0	6	8	8	3.96	1132/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	41	0	2	0	5	5	6	3.72	1250/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	42	2	1	2	7	2	3	3.27	1097/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	13	3	8	18	11	3.21	1222/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	5	3	10	12	23	3.85	1100/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	6	16	11	15	3.52	1182/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	9	2	8	14	14	3.47	742/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0102
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 284
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	22						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	59	Non-major	59
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	42				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 285
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	4	7	27	22	4.02	1131/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	4.02	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	11	22	27	4.16	959/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	10	24	26	4.14	897/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	3	5	7	15	13	3.70	1303/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	2	12	14	26	4.02	766/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.02	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	2	5	4	9	7	3.52	1206/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	1	9	18	32	4.30	767/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	1	0	1	37	22	4.30	1318/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	1	2	8	18	19	4.08	841/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	5	13	44	4.59	708/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	13	47	4.68	1006/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	9	18	31	4.23	917/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	2	4	23	29	4.25	897/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	8	18	31	4.34	391/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	6	10	28	13	3.66	1038/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.66	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	10	21	28	4.21	847/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	7	6	12	17	19	3.57	1165/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	5	3	12	16	21	3.79	590/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.79	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	63	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	63	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 285
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 2	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55 11	1.00-1.99 0	B 16			
56-83 6	2.00-2.99 3	C 18	General 0	Under-grad 64	Non-major 63
84-150 2	3.00-3.49 11	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 51		
		? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 286
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	4	7	27	22	4.02	1131/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	4.02	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	11	22	27	4.16	959/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	10	24	26	4.14	897/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	3	5	7	15	13	3.70	1303/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	2	12	14	26	4.02	766/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.02	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	2	5	4	9	7	3.52	1206/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	1	9	18	32	4.30	767/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	1	0	1	37	22	4.30	1318/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	2	3	22	16	4	3.36	1379/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	2	6	12	26	4.35	1010/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	2	2	6	11	24	4.18	1381/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	2	6	8	13	12	3.66	1295/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	1	2	9	12	15	3.97	1102/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	5	1	5	7	11	13	3.81	798/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	6	10	28	13	3.66	1038/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.66	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	10	21	28	4.21	847/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	7	6	12	17	19	3.57	1165/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	5	3	12	16	21	3.79	590/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.79	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	63	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	63	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 286
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	18	General	0	Under-grad	64	Non-major	63
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	11	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	51				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 287
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	4	7	27	22	4.02	1131/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	4.02	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	11	22	27	4.16	959/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	10	24	26	4.14	897/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	3	5	7	15	13	3.70	1303/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	2	12	14	26	4.02	766/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.02	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	2	5	4	9	7	3.52	1206/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	1	9	18	32	4.30	767/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	1	0	1	37	22	4.30	1318/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	3	0	2	11	20	11	3.91	1056/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	1	1	5	11	19	4.24	1102/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	3	6	14	16	4.10	1397/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	1	1	9	10	13	3.97	1112/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	3	0	5	10	16	4.06	1053/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	7	1	1	7	11	9	3.90	738/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	6	10	28	13	3.66	1038/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.66	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	10	21	28	4.21	847/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	7	6	12	17	19	3.57	1165/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	5	3	12	16	21	3.79	590/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.79	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	63	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	63	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: WILHIDE, JOSH (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 287
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 3	C 18	General 0	Under-grad 64 Non-major 63
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 11	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 51		
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 288
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	4	7	27	22	4.02	1131/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	4.02	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	11	22	27	4.16	959/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	10	24	26	4.14	897/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	3	5	7	15	13	3.70	1303/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	2	12	14	26	4.02	766/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.02	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	35	2	5	4	9	7	3.52	1206/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	1	9	18	32	4.30	767/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	1	0	1	37	22	4.30	1318/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	3	1	2	11	20	10	3.82	1125/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	1	5	12	19	4.32	1031/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	4	7	11	17	4.05	1405/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	1	2	10	11	11	3.83	1229/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	1	4	0	5	9	15	3.94	1135/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	7	1	2	6	12	8	3.83	791/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	6	10	28	13	3.66	1038/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.66	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	10	21	28	4.21	847/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	7	6	12	17	19	3.57	1165/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	5	3	12	16	21	3.79	590/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.79	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	63	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	63	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	63	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0103
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: ZIMMERMAN, SARA (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 288
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 2	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55 11	1.00-1.99 0	B 16			
56-83 6	2.00-2.99 3	C 18	General 0	Under-grad 64	Non-major 63
84-150 2	3.00-3.49 11	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 51		
		? 0			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: CARPENTER, TARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 289
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	5	18	21	16	3.71	1391/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	17	23	20	3.97	1158/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	5	14	16	25	4.02	969/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	2	4	13	13	15	3.74	1268/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	1	1	16	14	23	4.04	751/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	24	3	3	9	10	10	3.60	1154/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	8	15	15	19	3.65	1332/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	2	34	22	4.34	1280/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.34	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	0	1	13	20	8	3.83	1109/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	5	20	32	4.43	905/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	4	13	42	4.64	1060/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	12	17	28	4.20	939/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	10	17	29	4.19	953/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	2	2	9	14	25	4.12	569/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	14	6	9	12	14	3.11	1260/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	7	4	7	13	24	3.78	1132/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	8	6	11	14	15	3.41	1226/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	8	2	10	8	24	3.73	623/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	62	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	10	C	16	General	0	Under-grad	63	Non-major	61
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: HAMILTON, DIANA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 290
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	5	18	21	16	3.71	1391/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	17	23	20	3.97	1158/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	5	14	16	25	4.02	969/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	2	4	13	13	15	3.74	1268/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	1	1	16	14	23	4.04	751/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	24	3	3	9	10	10	3.60	1154/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	8	15	15	19	3.65	1332/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	2	34	22	4.34	1280/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.34	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	0	4	7	12	9	3	3.00	1477/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	30	0	3	2	7	12	9	3.67	1392/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	3	2	8	4	17	3.88	1446/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	5	3	7	9	8	3.38	1393/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	1	6	3	5	6	11	3.42	1364/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	4	5	2	3	11	5	3.35	1062/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	14	6	9	12	14	3.11	1260/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	7	4	7	13	24	3.78	1132/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	8	6	11	14	15	3.41	1226/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	8	2	10	8	24	3.73	623/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	62	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B 16			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	10	C 16	General	Under-grad 63	Non-major 61
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 1	Electives	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other		36
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: WASSINK, SARAH (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 291
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	5	18	21	16	3.71	1391/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	17	23	20	3.97	1158/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	5	14	16	25	4.02	969/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	2	4	13	13	15	3.74	1268/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	1	1	16	14	23	4.04	751/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	24	3	3	9	10	10	3.60	1154/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	8	15	15	19	3.65	1332/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	2	34	22	4.34	1280/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.34	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	2	1	0	7	15	7	3.90	1056/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	37	0	0	1	7	12	6	3.88	1324/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	1	1	4	7	17	4.27	1352/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	36	0	1	1	6	8	11	4.00	1083/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	37	0	2	0	6	5	13	4.04	1062/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	39	5	3	2	2	6	6	3.53	968/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	14	6	9	12	14	3.11	1260/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	7	4	7	13	24	3.78	1132/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	8	6	11	14	15	3.41	1226/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	8	2	10	8	24	3.73	623/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	62	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	10	C	16	General	0	Under-grad	63	Non-major	61
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 102 0104
 Title PRIN OF CHEMISTRY II
 Instructor: FEDEROWSKI, JEN (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 292
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	5	18	21	16	3.71	1391/1639	3.77	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	17	23	20	3.97	1158/1639	3.98	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	5	14	16	25	4.02	969/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	13	2	4	13	13	15	3.74	1268/1583	3.77	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	1	1	16	14	23	4.04	751/1532	3.98	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	24	3	3	9	10	10	3.60	1154/1504	3.46	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	8	15	15	19	3.65	1332/1612	3.96	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	2	34	22	4.34	1280/1635	4.32	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.34	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	2	3	4	15	5	3	3.03	1472/1579	3.54	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	37	0	1	3	9	6	7	3.58	1408/1518	4.14	4.21	4.43	4.38	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	0	3	9	6	12	3.90	1444/1520	4.18	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	36	0	2	5	7	4	9	3.48	1354/1517	3.82	3.96	4.27	4.20	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	4	8	2	12	3.74	1241/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	39	5	3	2	5	4	5	3.32	1076/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	14	6	9	12	14	3.11	1260/1398	3.36	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	7	4	7	13	24	3.78	1132/1391	4.01	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	8	6	11	14	15	3.41	1226/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	8	2	10	8	24	3.73	623/ 958	3.71	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	62	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B 16			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	10	C 16	General	Under-grad 63	Non-major 61
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 1	Electives	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other		36
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 293
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	7	7	4	3.41	1530/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	10	7	3.95	1176/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	3	5	7	1	3.38	1308/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	5	5	6	3.83	1205/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	5	8	5	3.84	957/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1051/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	8	4	3.67	1327/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	1107/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	0	8	8	3	3.48	1331/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	9	8	4.09	1206/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	1273/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	8	8	4.00	1083/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	7	7	3.64	1285/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	3	2	2	1	4	3.08	1150/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	5	0	4	3.89	1076/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1130/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	725/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	88/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	138/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.11	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	4	9	5	4.06	177/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.06	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	96/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	1	7	8	4.11	124/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	4.11	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 293
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	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	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 294
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	7	7	4	3.41	1530/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	10	7	3.95	1176/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	3	5	7	1	3.38	1308/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	5	5	6	3.83	1205/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	5	8	5	3.84	957/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1051/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	8	4	3.67	1327/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	1107/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	6	13	2	3.81	1133/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	1000/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	1356/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	886/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	1182/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	1	3	2	0	3	3.11	1146/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	5	0	4	3.89	1076/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1130/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	725/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	88/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	138/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.11	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	4	9	5	4.06	177/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.06	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	96/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	1	7	8	4.11	124/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	4.11	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0101
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 294
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	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	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0201
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 295
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4	6	5	3.58	1466/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	4	7	3.74	1369/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1170/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	4	3	7	3.82	1212/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	737/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	2	10	3	3.72	1075/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	7	4	5	3.47	1411/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1121/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1170/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	1237/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	1256/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	1083/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	4	6	3.67	1274/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	3	2	5	1	3	2.93	1191/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	2	1	2	4	6	3.73	178/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	142/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.07	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	160/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.27	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	0	2	4	7	3.93	174/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	3.93	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	141/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	3.93	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0201
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: KEATING, LORYN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 296
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4	6	5	3.58	1466/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	4	7	3.74	1369/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1170/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	4	3	7	3.82	1212/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	737/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	2	10	3	3.72	1075/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	7	4	5	3.47	1411/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	1121/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	4	6	3	3.56	1289/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	1237/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	1403/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	947/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	3	4	6	3.80	1215/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1023/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	2	1	2	4	6	3.73	178/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	3.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	142/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.07
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	160/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	0	2	4	7	3.93	174/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	3.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	141/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	3.93

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0301
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 297
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	9	6	3.95	1195/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	813/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	831/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	726/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	737/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	3	5	7	3.78	1034/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	5	9	3.90	1175/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	1034/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	4	8	3	3.75	1170/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	720/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	925/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	510/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	12	4.32	850/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	2	1	1	4	4	3.58	938/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	109/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	4.17	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	29/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	67/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	38/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0301
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 297
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0301
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMIY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 298
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	9	6	3.95	1195/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	813/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	831/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	726/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	737/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	3	5	7	3.78	1034/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	5	9	3.90	1175/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	1034/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	2	9	4	4.00	889/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	575/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	1	17	4.74	925/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	462/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	614/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	753/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	109/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	4.17	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	29/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	67/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	38/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0301
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMIY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 298
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0401
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 299
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	2	5	5	3.63	1441/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	1044/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1131/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	4	6	2	3.43	1440/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	5	4	3.60	1184/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1042/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	5	4	3.63	1349/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1114/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1133/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	1042/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	1292/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	1083/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1135/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	2	8	1	3.36	1058/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1106/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1241/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1248/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	888/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	2.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	3	0	0	3	1	2.86	212/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	2.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	172/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	3.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	158/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	158/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	94/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	4.29	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0401
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 299
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0401
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: DAVIS, SONNETT (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 300
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	2	5	5	3.63	1441/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	1044/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1131/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	4	6	2	3.43	1440/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	5	4	3.60	1184/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1042/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	5	4	3.63	1349/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1114/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	889/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	1077/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1398/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.23	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	864/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	0	5	4	3.82	1209/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1089/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1106/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1241/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1248/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	888/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	2.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	3	0	0	3	1	2.86	212/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	2.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	172/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	3.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	158/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	158/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	94/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	4.29	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0401
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: DAVIS, SONNETT (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 300
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0501
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 301
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	4	4	3.57	1466/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	970/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	850/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	792/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	7	3	3.69	1112/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	1075/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1148/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	840/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1251/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	968/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	1166/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	907/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	982/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	0	1	5	1	3.33	1067/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	965/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1146/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1095/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	97/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	4.27	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	91/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.45	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	116/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.55	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	109/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	4.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	110/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0501
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: GRIMM, IVY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 302
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	4	4	3.57	1466/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	970/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	850/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	792/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	7	3	3.69	1112/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	1075/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1148/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	840/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	889/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	602/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1033/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	597/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	755/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	623/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	965/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1146/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1095/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	97/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	4.27	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	91/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.45	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	116/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.55	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	109/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	4.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	110/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0601
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 303
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	2	9	4.00	1138/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	800/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	687/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1010/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	714/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	780/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	6	3	5	3.93	1148/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1023/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	691/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	720/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	1060/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	597/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	875/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	943/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1271/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1289/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1320/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	88/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	56/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	46/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	96/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	95/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	4.27	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0601
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 304
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	2	9	4.00	1138/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	800/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	687/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1010/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	714/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	780/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	6	3	5	3.93	1148/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1023/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	818/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	1077/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	1379/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	864/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1209/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	978/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1271/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1289/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1320/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	88/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	56/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	46/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	96/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	95/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	4.27	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0701
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 305
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	10	10	4.17	990/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	14	7	4.00	1090/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	4	4	1	5	3.33	1318/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	2	2	7	4	3.69	1310/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	7	11	4.17	648/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	6	5	7	3.80	1010/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	7	4	8	3.58	1367/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	968/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	0	0	7	5	3	3.73	1185/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	5	15	4.46	877/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	1213/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	5	13	4.25	886/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	6	12	4.17	972/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	0	6	4	3	3.57	943/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1198/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1106/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	1130/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	80/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	96/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	112/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	106/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	4.47	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	86/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0701
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 305
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0701
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMIY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 306
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	10	10	4.17	990/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	14	7	4.00	1090/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	4	4	1	5	3.33	1318/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	2	2	7	4	3.69	1310/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	7	11	4.17	648/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	6	5	7	3.80	1010/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	7	4	8	3.58	1367/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	968/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	3	9	3	4.00	889/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	1155/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	1264/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1016/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1077/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	9	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	1089/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1198/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1106/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	1130/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	80/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	96/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	112/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	106/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	4.47	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	86/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0701
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: GANGULY, SOUMIY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 306
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0801
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 307
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	10	4	3.78	1345/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	9	5	3.94	1193/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	7	5	2	3.64	1228/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	8	3	3.61	1359/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	8	3	3.75	1046/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1010/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1327/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	928/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1109/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	9	7	4.17	1162/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	1367/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	1016/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.02	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	7	5	3.83	1198/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.02	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	7	6	0	3.20	1122/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	180/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	190/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	3.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	179/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	190/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	3.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	7	0	3	3.45	174/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	3.45	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2		
				Other	13

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0801
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: ORWENYO, JARED (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 308
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	10	4	3.78	1345/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	9	5	3.94	1193/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	7	5	2	3.64	1228/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	8	3	3.61	1359/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	8	3	3.75	1046/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1010/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1327/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	928/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1125/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	1141/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	1345/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	1162/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.02	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	927/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.02	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	2	7	1	3.64	911/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	180/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	190/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	3.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	179/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	190/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	3.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	7	0	3	3.45	174/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	3.45	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 18
				P 0	Electives 0
				I 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				? 2	Other 13

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0901
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 309
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	8	3	3.75	1358/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	1090/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1052/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	2	1	6	3	3.62	1359/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	4	3	3.33	1330/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	945/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	7	3	3.60	1360/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	811/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	9	2	3.93	1022/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	1042/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.16	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	1247/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	886/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1177/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	864/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	426/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	190/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	3.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	130/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.20	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	51/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	137/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	47/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 0901
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: KEATING, LORYN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 310
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	8	3	3.75	1358/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	1090/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1052/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	2	1	6	3	3.62	1359/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	4	3	3.33	1330/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	945/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	7	3	3.60	1360/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	811/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	7	4	0	2.93	1505/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1237/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.16	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1402/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	1083/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	5	3	2	3.31	1393/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	894/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	426/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	190/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	3.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	130/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.20	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	51/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	137/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	47/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 1001
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J. (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 311
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	7	4	3.79	1339/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1227/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1318/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1303/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	965/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	775/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	3	3	3.43	1432/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1114/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	2	7	1	3.64	1251/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	1000/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	1256/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	990/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	3	5	3.79	1223/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	2	4	2	2	3.40	1035/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	770/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	863/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	872/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	186/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	115/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	150/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	109/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	4.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	154/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	3.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 13
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 1	Other 12

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 102L 1001
 Title INTRO CHEMISTRY LAB I
 Instructor: DAVIS, SONNETT (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 312
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	1	7	4	3.79	1339/1639	3.76	3.87	4.27	4.08	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1227/1639	4.04	4.00	4.22	4.17	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1318/1397	3.80	3.93	4.28	4.18	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1303/1583	3.83	3.70	4.19	4.01	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	965/1532	3.84	3.83	4.01	3.88	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	775/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	3.78	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	3	3	3.43	1432/1612	3.68	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1114/1635	4.64	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	830/1579	3.80	3.74	4.08	3.95	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1175/1518	4.30	4.21	4.43	4.38	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1388/1520	4.38	4.35	4.70	4.61	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	854/1517	4.23	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1077/1550	3.97	3.87	4.22	4.17	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1101/1295	3.44	3.69	3.94	3.84	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	770/1398	3.67	3.50	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	863/1391	3.72	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	872/1388	3.60	3.45	4.28	4.01	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 958	3.15	3.45	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	186/ 224	3.91	4.04	4.10	3.90	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	115/ 240	4.27	4.24	4.11	4.01	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	150/ 219	4.44	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	109/ 215	4.33	4.28	4.35	4.43	4.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	154/ 198	4.17	4.18	4.18	4.25	3.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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 12		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 123 0101
 Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON
 Enrollment: 74
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 313
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	34	4.80	257/1639	4.80	3.87	4.27	4.08	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	34	4.83	184/1639	4.83	4.00	4.22	4.17	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	36	4.85	196/1397	4.85	3.93	4.28	4.18	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	1	1	27	4.80	186/1583	4.80	3.70	4.19	4.01	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	4	2	9	18	4.24	589/1532	4.24	3.83	4.01	3.88	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	1	0	5	15	4.45	429/1504	4.45	3.54	4.05	3.78	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	6	33	4.78	197/1612	4.78	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	27	4.68	990/1635	4.68	4.76	4.65	4.56	4.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	137/1579	4.81	3.74	4.08	3.95	4.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.21	4.43	4.38	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.35	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	37	4.88	181/1517	4.88	3.96	4.27	4.20	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	38	4.93	139/1550	4.93	3.87	4.22	4.17	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	2	1	4	1	12	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.69	3.94	3.84	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	485/1398	4.43	3.50	4.07	3.85	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	3	5	12	4.14	911/1391	4.14	3.91	4.30	4.07	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	2	4	15	4.45	693/1388	4.45	3.45	4.28	4.01	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	8	0	4	1	2	7	3.86	554/ 958	3.86	3.45	3.93	3.71	3.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 123 0101
 Title GEN ORGANIC & BIOCHEM
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON
 Enrollment: 74
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 313
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	41	Non-major	41
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 314
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	1397/1639	3.96	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	1	7	4.08	1036/1639	4.18	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	888/1397	4.30	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	697/1583	4.11	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	989/1532	3.69	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1212/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1294/1612	4.18	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.98	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	830/1579	4.04	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	435/1518	4.56	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	1222/1520	4.45	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	747/1517	4.20	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	0	10	4.54	603/1550	4.36	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	581/1295	3.93	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	158/ 224	4.24	4.04	4.10	4.06	3.89	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	115/ 240	4.33	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	150/ 219	4.65	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	128/ 215	4.62	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	86/ 198	4.32	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: VAVILALA, SUMA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 315
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	1397/1639	3.96	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	1	7	4.08	1036/1639	4.18	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	888/1397	4.30	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	697/1583	4.11	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	989/1532	3.69	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1212/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1294/1612	4.18	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.98	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1170/1579	4.04	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1327/1518	4.56	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1488/1520	4.45	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1393/1517	4.20	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1077/1550	4.36	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1295	3.93	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	158/ 224	4.24	4.04	4.10	4.06	3.89	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	115/ 240	4.33	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	150/ 219	4.65	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	128/ 215	4.62	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	86/ 198	4.32	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0101
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 316
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	1397/1639	3.96	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	1	7	4.08	1036/1639	4.18	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	888/1397	4.30	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	697/1583	4.11	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	989/1532	3.69	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1212/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1294/1612	4.18	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.98	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	889/1579	4.04	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	720/1518	4.56	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1292/1520	4.45	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	510/1517	4.20	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	638/1550	4.36	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1295	3.93	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	158/ 224	4.24	4.04	4.10	4.06	3.89	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	115/ 240	4.33	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	150/ 219	4.65	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	128/ 215	4.62	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	86/ 198	4.32	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 317
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	11	5	4.05	1103/1639	3.96	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	1052/1639	4.18	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	632/1397	4.30	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1324/1583	4.11	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	6	4	2	3.33	1330/1532	3.69	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	990/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	860/1612	4.18	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	397/1635	4.98	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	9	4	4.00	889/1579	4.04	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	720/1518	4.56	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	1136/1520	4.45	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	1142/1517	4.20	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	927/1550	4.36	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	3	2	6	3	3.31	1076/1295	3.93	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	105/ 224	4.24	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	96/ 240	4.33	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	87/ 219	4.65	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	49/ 215	4.62	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	110/ 198	4.32	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.19	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	7	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	17				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: KISER, JOHN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 318
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	11	5	4.05	1103/1639	3.96	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	1052/1639	4.18	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	632/1397	4.30	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1324/1583	4.11	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	6	4	2	3.33	1330/1532	3.69	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	990/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	860/1612	4.18	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	397/1635	4.98	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	601/1579	4.04	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	643/1518	4.56	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	943/1520	4.45	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	864/1517	4.20	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	522/1550	4.36	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/1295	3.93	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	105/ 224	4.24	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	96/ 240	4.33	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	87/ 219	4.65	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	49/ 215	4.62	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	110/ 198	4.32	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.19	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	7	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	17				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0102
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: ZUKOWSKI, ELI (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 319
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	11	5	4.05	1103/1639	3.96	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	1052/1639	4.18	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	632/1397	4.30	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1324/1583	4.11	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	6	4	2	3.33	1330/1532	3.69	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	990/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	860/1612	4.18	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	397/1635	4.98	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	2	9	1	3.92	1039/1579	4.04	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	757/1518	4.56	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1299/1520	4.45	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1030/1517	4.20	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	1029/1550	4.36	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/1295	3.93	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	105/ 224	4.24	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	96/ 240	4.33	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	87/ 219	4.65	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	49/ 215	4.62	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	110/ 198	4.32	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.19	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 19	Non-major 18
84-150	7	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 17		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0104
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: CULLUM, BRIAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 320
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	1029/1639	3.96	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	684/1639	4.18	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	722/1397	4.30	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	697/1583	4.11	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	869/1532	3.69	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	667/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	388/1612	4.18	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.98	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	473/1579	4.04	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	491/1518	4.56	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	382/1520	4.45	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	875/1517	4.20	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	603/1550	4.36	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	361/1295	3.93	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	44/ 224	4.24	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.64	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	8	5	4.21	129/ 240	4.33	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.21	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	28/ 219	4.65	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.93	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	70/ 215	4.62	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	72/ 198	4.32	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.43	

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	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	4	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	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0104
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: KISER, JOHN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 321
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	1029/1639	3.96	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	684/1639	4.18	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	722/1397	4.30	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	697/1583	4.11	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	869/1532	3.69	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	667/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	388/1612	4.18	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.98	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	760/1579	4.04	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	454/1518	4.56	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1115/1520	4.45	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	700/1517	4.20	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	638/1550	4.36	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1295	3.93	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	44/ 224	4.24	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.64	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	8	5	4.21	129/ 240	4.33	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.21	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	28/ 219	4.65	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.93	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	70/ 215	4.62	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	72/ 198	4.32	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.43	

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	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	4	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	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 300 0104
 Title ANALYTICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: VAVILALA, SUMA (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 322
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	1029/1639	3.96	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	684/1639	4.18	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	722/1397	4.30	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	697/1583	4.11	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	869/1532	3.69	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	667/1504	3.84	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	388/1612	4.18	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.98	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	4	2	3.67	1232/1579	4.04	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	656/1518	4.56	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1239/1520	4.45	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	700/1517	4.20	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	897/1550	4.36	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1295	3.93	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	44/ 224	4.24	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.64	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	8	5	4.21	129/ 240	4.33	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.21	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	28/ 219	4.65	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.93	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	70/ 215	4.62	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	72/ 198	4.32	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.43	

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	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	4	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	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 301 0101
 Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY
 Enrollment: 74
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 323
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	11	22	4.50	615/1639	4.50	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	12	21	4.47	567/1639	4.47	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	21	4.47	560/1397	4.47	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	939/1583	4.11	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	3	9	8	9	3.45	1270/1532	3.45	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	478/1504	4.41	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	26	4.67	317/1612	4.67	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	14	16	4.44	461/1579	4.44	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	330/1518	4.82	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	30	4.85	674/1520	4.85	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	15	17	4.48	622/1517	4.48	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	27	4.79	300/1550	4.79	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	3	0	7	4	5	3.42	1023/1295	3.42	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 301 0101
 Title PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY
 Enrollment: 74
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 323
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	32
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101
 Title ADVANCED LAB I
 Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 324
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	990/1639	3.92	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1090/1639	3.75	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	973/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	5	3	3.82	1219/1583	3.91	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	1195/1532	3.79	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	824/1504	4.00	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	617/1612	4.24	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1133/1579	3.39	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1206/1518	3.83	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	802/1520	4.30	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1301/1517	3.28	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1077/1550	3.49	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1035/1295	3.53	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1162/1398	3.56	3.50	4.07	4.13	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1192/1391	3.44	3.91	4.30	4.35	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1157/1388	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.34	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	117/ 224	4.02	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.10	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	163/ 240	3.98	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.90	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	125/ 219	4.45	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	158/ 215	4.10	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	147/ 198	3.92	4.18	4.18	4.04	3.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 2		

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101
 Title ADVANCED LAB I
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 325
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	990/1639	3.92	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1090/1639	3.75	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	973/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	5	3	3.82	1219/1583	3.91	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	1195/1532	3.79	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	824/1504	4.00	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	617/1612	4.24	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	2	3	0	3.14	1453/1579	3.39	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1518	3.83	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1520	4.30	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1517	3.28	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1550	3.49	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1162/1398	3.56	3.50	4.07	4.13	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1192/1391	3.44	3.91	4.30	4.35	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1157/1388	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.34	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	117/ 224	4.02	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.10	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	163/ 240	3.98	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.90	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	125/ 219	4.45	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	158/ 215	4.10	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	147/ 198	3.92	4.18	4.18	4.04	3.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0101
 Title ADVANCED LAB I
 Instructor: ZHANG, HAILANG (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 326
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	990/1639	3.92	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	1090/1639	3.75	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	973/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	5	3	3.82	1219/1583	3.91	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	1195/1532	3.79	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	824/1504	4.00	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	617/1612	4.24	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1364/1579	3.39	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1518	3.83	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1520	4.30	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1517	3.28	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1162/1398	3.56	3.50	4.07	4.13	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1192/1391	3.44	3.91	4.30	4.35	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1157/1388	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.34	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	117/ 224	4.02	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.10	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	163/ 240	3.98	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.90	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	125/ 219	4.45	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	158/ 215	4.10	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	147/ 198	3.92	4.18	4.18	4.04	3.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201
 Title ADVANCED LAB I
 Instructor: VINCENT, JAMES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 327
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	7	4	3.67	1416/1639	3.92	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	7	3	3.50	1481/1639	3.75	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	973/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	1010/1583	3.91	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	774/1532	3.79	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	824/1504	4.00	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	1010/1612	4.24	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	7	3	3.71	1208/1579	3.39	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	1077/1518	3.83	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	943/1520	4.30	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	10	4	3	3.59	1317/1517	3.28	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	2	6	5	3.59	1303/1550	3.49	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	894/1295	3.53	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	987/1398	3.56	3.50	4.07	4.13	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	2	2	1	4	3.27	1278/1391	3.44	3.91	4.30	4.35	3.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	3	1	2	3	3.09	1308/1388	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.34	3.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	147/ 224	4.02	4.04	4.10	4.06	3.93	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	3	1	3	8	4.07	142/ 240	3.98	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.07	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	138/ 219	4.45	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	137/ 215	4.10	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	141/ 198	3.92	4.18	4.18	4.04	3.93	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201
 Title ADVANCED LAB I
 Instructor: KATZ, CIVIA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 328
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	7	4	3.67	1416/1639	3.92	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	7	3	3.50	1481/1639	3.75	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	973/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	1010/1583	3.91	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	774/1532	3.79	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	824/1504	4.00	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	1010/1612	4.24	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	9	2	1	3.00	1477/1579	3.39	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1474/1518	3.83	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1492/1520	4.30	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1493/1517	3.28	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	1	1	0	3	2.88	1466/1550	3.49	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1295	3.53	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	987/1398	3.56	3.50	4.07	4.13	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	2	2	1	4	3.27	1278/1391	3.44	3.91	4.30	4.35	3.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	3	1	2	3	3.09	1308/1388	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.34	3.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	147/ 224	4.02	4.04	4.10	4.06	3.93	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	3	1	3	8	4.07	142/ 240	3.98	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.07	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	138/ 219	4.45	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	137/ 215	4.10	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	141/ 198	3.92	4.18	4.18	4.04	3.93	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 311L 0201
 Title ADVANCED LAB I
 Instructor: ZHANG, HAILANG (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 329
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	7	4	3.67	1416/1639	3.92	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	7	3	3.50	1481/1639	3.75	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	973/1397	4.00	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	1010/1583	3.91	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	774/1532	3.79	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	824/1504	4.00	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	1010/1612	4.24	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	9	1	1	3.27	1412/1579	3.39	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1341/1518	3.83	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1383/1520	4.30	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1433/1517	3.28	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1328/1550	3.49	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1295	3.53	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	987/1398	3.56	3.50	4.07	4.13	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	2	2	1	4	3.27	1278/1391	3.44	3.91	4.30	4.35	3.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	3	1	2	3	3.09	1308/1388	3.35	3.45	4.28	4.34	3.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	147/ 224	4.02	4.04	4.10	4.06	3.93	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	3	1	3	8	4.07	142/ 240	3.98	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.07	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	138/ 219	4.45	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	137/ 215	4.10	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	141/ 198	3.92	4.18	4.18	4.04	3.93	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK
 Enrollment: 168
 Questionnaires: 121

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 330
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	3	10	20	25	60	4.09	1075/1639	4.21	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	6	4	19	36	52	4.06	1052/1639	4.01	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	5	4	19	37	53	4.09	938/1397	3.89	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	44	5	4	10	22	31	3.97	1054/1583	3.88	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.97	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	10	3	5	14	26	60	4.25	580/1532	4.25	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	61	2	5	8	17	24	4.00	824/1504	3.99	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	5	23	34	52	4.09	989/1612	4.11	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	2	1	8	106	4.86	721/1635	4.92	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	4	3	2	9	42	32	4.11	818/1579	4.00	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	1	11	27	75	4.45	877/1518	4.48	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	3	7	105	4.83	750/1520	4.83	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	9	17	38	49	4.04	1059/1517	4.01	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	7	8	20	24	57	4.00	1077/1550	4.04	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	16	3	5	13	25	51	4.20	505/1295	3.81	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	86	0	4	1	9	7	14	3.74	972/1398	3.74	3.50	4.07	4.13	3.74	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	86	0	2	1	5	3	24	4.31	769/1391	4.31	3.91	4.30	4.35	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	86	0	3	2	10	5	15	3.77	1088/1388	3.77	3.45	4.28	4.34	3.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	86	2	2	1	4	1	25	4.39	272/ 958	4.39	3.45	3.93	3.97	4.39	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	103	0	2	0	7	3	6	3.61	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	103	0	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	103	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	103	1	2	0	3	3	9	4.00	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	103	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	116	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	116	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	117	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	118	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	119	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	118	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	119	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	119	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	118	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	118	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	118	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	118	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	118	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0101
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I
Instructor: PERKS, MARK
Enrollment: 168
Questionnaires: 121

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 330
FEB 13, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 17	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	27	1.00-1.99 0	B 37		
56-83	25	2.00-2.99 11	C 34	General 1	Under-grad 121 Non-major 114
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 24	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 28	F 2	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 2	Other 97	
			? 6		

Course-Section: CHEM 351 0201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY I
 Instructor: HOSMANE, RAMACH
 Enrollment: 251
 Questionnaires: 120

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 331
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	3	18	34	62	4.32	823/1639	4.21	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	8	21	47	39	3.97	1158/1639	4.01	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	7	12	24	41	33	3.69	1204/1397	3.89	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	40	2	6	21	24	23	3.79	1240/1583	3.88	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	4	1	18	27	59	4.25	589/1532	4.25	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	70	1	3	6	20	14	3.98	860/1504	3.99	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.98	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	6	21	39	48	4.13	944/1612	4.11	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	0	1	0	0	110	4.97	199/1635	4.92	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	1	1	6	23	36	28	3.89	1063/1579	4.00	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	10	34	70	4.50	807/1518	4.48	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	3	13	98	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	4	4	17	52	35	3.98	1102/1517	4.01	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	7	22	33	51	4.08	1043/1550	4.04	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	33	10	6	19	25	17	3.43	1023/1295	3.81	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	97	0	11	1	2	5	4	2.57	****/1398	3.74	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	97	0	5	1	6	4	7	3.30	****/1391	4.31	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	97	0	7	1	4	7	4	3.00	****/1388	3.77	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	98	15	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	****/ 958	4.39	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	112	1	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	114	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	114	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	114	1	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	114	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	116	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	118	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	118	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	118	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	118	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	118	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	117	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	117	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	117	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	117	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 33	Required for Majors 0
28-55	30	1.00-1.99	0	B 48	
56-83	18	2.00-2.99	9	C 17	General 0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	17	D 0	Under-grad 120
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	36	F 1	Non-major 113
Electives 1					
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	97	
?	3			

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 332
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1303/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	1090/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1165/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1247/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1136/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1092/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	1327/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1294/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1309/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1033/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1317/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	1237/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	3	1	3	3.20	1122/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	198/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	3.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	163/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	116/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.55	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	139/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.18	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	61/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	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 0	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 9		
				? 1			

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: GROW, MARGARET (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 333
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1303/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	1090/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1165/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1247/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1136/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1092/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	1327/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1155/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1351/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1500/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1310/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1488/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	198/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	3.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	163/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	116/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.55	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	139/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.18	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	61/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 334
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	1096/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	1044/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	813/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	891/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	377/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	416/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	934/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1039/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	602/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	925/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	875/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	890/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	0	3	9	4.21	489/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	770/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	834/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	0	0	2	8	4.17	109/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.17	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	80/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	161/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	109/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	38/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: KHATRI, RAJU (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 335
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	1096/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	1044/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	813/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	891/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	377/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	416/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	934/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	889/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	708/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1033/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	973/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1038/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	265/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	770/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	834/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	0	0	2	8	4.17	109/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.17	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	80/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	161/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	109/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	38/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0301
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 336
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1466/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	970/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1343/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1226/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	965/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1212/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1299/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1284/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1341/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	1318/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1292/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1385/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	2.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1067/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1395/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	1.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1321/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1320/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	213/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	2.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	148/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	170/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.17	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	158/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	114/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0301
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 337
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1466/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	970/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1343/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1226/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	965/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1212/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1299/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	4	0	3.29	1409/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1419/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1414/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1424/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	1488/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	2.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1395/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	1.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1321/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1320/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	213/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	2.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	148/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	170/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.17	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	158/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	114/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0401
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 338
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	615/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	650/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	888/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	697/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	419/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	568/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	934/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	889/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	919/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	597/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	603/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	243/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	60/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.46	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	76/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.54	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	63/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.77	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	59/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.77	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	45/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.62	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0401
Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 338
FEB 13, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0401
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: TOMNEY, MATT (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 339
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	615/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	650/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	888/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	697/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	419/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	568/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	934/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	312/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	435/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	699/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	371/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	253/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	529/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	60/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.46	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	76/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.54	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	63/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.77	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	59/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.77	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	45/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.62	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0401
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: TOMNEY, MATT (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 339
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0501
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 340
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1240/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1244/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	1086/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	1226/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	965/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	5	4	3.83	990/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	913/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	595/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	737/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	561/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	1273/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	726/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	638/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	459/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1222/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	983/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1356/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	786/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	159/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	3.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	199/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	179/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	202/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	3.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	159/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	3.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0501
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: KLUTSE, CHARLES (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 341
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1240/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1244/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	1086/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	1226/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	965/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	5	4	3.83	990/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	913/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	595/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1318/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1361/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1478/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.03	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1328/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.98	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1188/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	978/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1222/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	983/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1356/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	786/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	159/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	3.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	199/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	179/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	202/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	3.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	159/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	3.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0601
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 342
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	11	2	4.07	1089/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	0	3.50	1481/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	6	5	0	3.33	1318/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	4	5	0	3.08	1522/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	774/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	7	0	3.58	1165/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	4	2	3.43	1432/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	841/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	863/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	872/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	3.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	8	2	3.85	1217/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	1077/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	731/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	119/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.08	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	133/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	67/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	153/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.08	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	178/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0601
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: SADLER, JOSH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 343
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	11	2	4.07	1089/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	0	3.50	1481/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	6	5	0	3.33	1318/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	4	5	0	3.08	1522/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	774/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	5	7	0	3.58	1165/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	4	2	3.43	1432/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	7	1	3.82	1125/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1437/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	2	2	2	0	2.71	1517/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	3.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	1424/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1440/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	119/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.08	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	133/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	67/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	153/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.08	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	178/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	B 8		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	13

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0701
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 344
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	990/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	774/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	6	1	3	3.45	1284/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	946/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	774/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	1388/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1044/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	7	2	3.90	1056/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	933/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	491/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	4	6	4.17	973/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	8	4.17	972/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.02	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	305/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	770/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1200/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1262/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	3.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	129/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	37/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.78	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	91/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	57/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	54/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0701
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 345
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	990/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	774/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	6	1	3	3.45	1284/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	946/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	774/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	1388/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1044/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	691/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	891/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	1414/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	886/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1177/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.02	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	770/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1200/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1262/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	3.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	0	0	1	6	4.00	129/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	37/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.78	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	91/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	57/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	54/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0801
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 346
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1055/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	774/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	822/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1247/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	607/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	747/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	317/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	783/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	891/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	855/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	674/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1019/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	4	0	3.38	1048/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	49/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	74/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	132/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	77/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	122/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.13	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0801
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: TOMNEY, MATT (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 347
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1055/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	774/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	822/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1247/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	607/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	747/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	317/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	312/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	656/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	622/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	299/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	796/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	894/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.52	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	49/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	74/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	132/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	77/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	122/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.13	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0901
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 348
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	870/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1319/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1190/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1010/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	700/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1034/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	490/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1056/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1077/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	943/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1280/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	1250/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	135/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	117/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.10	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	182/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	85/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	83/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	108/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 0901
 Title: ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: GROW, MARGARET (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 349
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	870/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1319/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1190/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1010/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	700/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1034/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	490/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	159/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	4.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	474/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	623/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	117/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.10	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	182/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	85/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	83/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	108/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1001
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 350
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1138/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	1427/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	1287/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1158/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1241/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	747/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1253/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1270/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	1318/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.01	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	943/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1235/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	2	4	2	3.18	1415/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1143/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	916/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1192/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1226/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	191/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	3.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	98/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	110/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	86/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	51/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1001
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: KHATRI, RAJU (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 351
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1138/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	1427/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	1287/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1158/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1241/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	747/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1253/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	889/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	1196/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.01	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1151/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1193/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	4	1	3.22	1407/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1158/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	916/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1192/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1226/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	191/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	3.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	98/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	110/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	86/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	51/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 352
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	1296/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	2	3.69	1393/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	1219/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1010/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	774/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	945/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1310/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	0	4	6	1	3.31	1402/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	0	7	3	3.92	1309/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	725/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	1347/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1038/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	0	4	5	4.09	581/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	156/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	3.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	163/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	145/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	152/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.09	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	108/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1101
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: OLESKE, JEFF (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 353
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	1296/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	2	3.69	1393/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	1219/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1010/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	774/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	945/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1310/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1170/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	5	0	3.50	1419/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	5	0	3.50	1492/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1199/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1424/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	156/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	3.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	163/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	145/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	152/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.09	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	108/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 354
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	1096/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	992/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1151/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1113/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	2	7	4.14	670/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	713/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	2	4	4	3.50	1399/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	943/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	1232/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	1237/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	1115/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	8	3	3.80	1241/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.01	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1135/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	806/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	129/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	139/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.09	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	159/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.27	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	181/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	3.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	147/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	3.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1201
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: TEMBERNIKAR, KA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 355
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	1096/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	992/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1151/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1113/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	2	7	4.14	670/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	713/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	2	4	4	3.50	1399/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	943/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	889/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1237/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1318/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	917/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	4.01	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	832/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	825/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	129/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	139/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.09	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	159/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.27	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	181/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	3.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	147/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	3.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1301
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 356
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1546/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	2	1	3.00	1579/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	0	3	1	3.14	1346/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	1562/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	2.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1330/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1378/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	3	0	2.89	1550/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	2.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1257/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	2.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1408/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	2.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1414/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	3.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1418/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	2.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1360/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	2.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	978/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	129/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	212/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	179/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	212/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	2.40
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	196/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	2.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1301
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: KLUTSE, CHARLES (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 357
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1546/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	2	1	3.00	1579/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	0	3	1	3.14	1346/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	1562/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	2.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1330/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1378/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	3	0	2.89	1550/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	2.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	5	0	0	0	1.71	1578/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	2.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	0	3	0	0	2.00	1512/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	2.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1518/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	3.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	1	1	0	0	1.50	1514/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	2.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	1	0	0	0	1.17	1548/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	2.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1273/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	129/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	212/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	179/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	212/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	2.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	196/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	2.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1401
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 358
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1003/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1036/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1300/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1010/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	269/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	775/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	3	3	3.31	1461/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	1345/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	1237/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	992/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1217/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	6	4	3.77	1232/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	720/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	82/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	110/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	97/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	139/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.18	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	126/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.10	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1401
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: VOKKALIGA, SMIT (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 359
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	1003/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1036/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1300/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1010/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	269/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	775/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	3	3	3.31	1461/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	4	0	3.33	1390/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	5	2	1	3.22	1463/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1394/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1292/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	4	0	3.13	1428/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	82/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	110/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	97/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	139/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.18	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	126/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.10	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1501
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 360
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1055/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1090/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1118/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1178/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	607/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1240/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	848/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1270/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1361/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	855/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1328/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1228/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1113/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	129/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	137/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	161/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	158/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	61/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1501
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: HOLEWINSKI, RON (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 361
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1055/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1090/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1118/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1178/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	607/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1240/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	848/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	889/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1237/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1457/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	947/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1411/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	129/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	137/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	161/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	158/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	61/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1601
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 362
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	1	1	8	0	3.70	1391/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1388/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	2	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1238/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1247/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	911/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	5	4	0	3.44	1240/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	2	3	1	3.00	1519/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1133/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1400/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	890/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	2	3	1	3.38	1393/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1289/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	623/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	129/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	168/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	67/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	184/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	3.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	150/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1601
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: SADLER, JOSH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 363
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	1	1	8	0	3.70	1391/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1388/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	2	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1238/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1247/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	911/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	5	4	0	3.44	1240/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	2	3	1	3.00	1519/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	889/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1237/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1498/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	4.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1276/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	1188/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	129/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	168/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	67/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	184/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	3.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	150/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1701
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 364
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	990/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	948/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	878/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1226/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	640/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	667/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	2	3	3.42	1436/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	928/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1071/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	708/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	1188/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	3.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	973/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1152/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	481/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	560/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	489/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	783/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	658/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	88/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	56/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	46/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	142/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.17	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	47/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1701
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: PERKS, MARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 364
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1701
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: VOKKALIGA, SMIT (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 365
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	990/1639	3.99	3.87	4.27	4.28	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	948/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	878/1397	3.71	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1226/1583	3.82	3.70	4.19	4.24	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	640/1532	4.03	3.83	4.01	4.05	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	667/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	2	3	3.42	1436/1612	3.78	3.95	4.16	4.12	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	928/1635	4.95	4.76	4.65	4.66	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	1	4	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.78	3.74	4.08	4.07	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1472/1518	4.01	4.21	4.43	4.39	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1507/1520	4.29	4.35	4.70	4.68	3.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	1	4	0	3.14	1442/1517	3.83	3.96	4.27	4.23	3.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1419/1550	3.69	3.87	4.22	4.20	3.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1229/1295	3.74	3.69	3.94	3.95	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	560/1398	3.48	3.50	4.07	4.13	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	489/1391	3.97	3.91	4.30	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	783/1388	3.50	3.45	4.28	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	658/ 958	3.33	3.45	3.93	3.97	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	88/ 224	3.98	4.04	4.10	4.06	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	56/ 240	4.16	4.24	4.11	4.08	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	46/ 219	4.47	4.50	4.44	4.44	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	142/ 215	4.12	4.28	4.35	4.21	4.17	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	47/ 198	4.14	4.18	4.18	4.04	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 1701
 Title ORGANIC CHEMISTRY LAB
 Instructor: VOKKALIGA, SMIT (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 365
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 405 0101
 Title INORGANIC CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: SZALAI, VERONIK
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 366
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	1003/1639	4.15	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	4	7	3.50	1481/1639	3.50	4.00	4.22	4.29	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	3	0	10	3.50	1268/1397	3.50	3.93	4.28	4.38	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	2	5	3	5	3.73	1275/1583	3.73	3.70	4.19	4.31	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	3	1	4	6	3.28	1353/1532	3.28	3.83	4.01	4.07	3.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	997/1504	3.82	3.54	4.05	4.20	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	1	2	4	8	3.72	1294/1612	3.72	3.95	4.16	4.18	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1342/1635	4.26	4.76	4.65	4.72	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1402/1579	3.31	3.74	4.08	4.21	3.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	708/1518	4.59	4.21	4.43	4.51	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	979/1520	4.71	4.35	4.70	4.75	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	4	6	4	3.65	1298/1517	3.65	3.96	4.27	4.34	3.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	3	4	6	3.65	1281/1550	3.65	3.87	4.22	4.24	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	4	0	4	2	3	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.69	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	426/1398	4.50	3.50	4.07	4.23	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	887/1391	4.17	3.91	4.30	4.48	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	887/1388	4.17	3.45	4.28	4.50	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	380/ 958	4.20	3.45	3.93	4.24	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 224	****	4.04	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 215	****	4.28	4.35	4.28	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	4.18	4.18	4.21	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.85	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	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 1 Graduate 5 Major 18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 5	General 1 Under-grad 15 Non-major 2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D 1	
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	Other 16
				? 3	

Course-Section: CHEM 420 0101
 Title COMUPTE APPL IN CHEM
 Instructor: KELLY, LISA A.
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 367
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1252/1639	3.90	3.87	4.27	4.42	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1003/1639	4.11	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1397	****	3.93	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	697/1583	4.33	3.70	4.19	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	3	3	0	2.50	1501/1532	2.50	3.83	4.01	4.07	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1278/1504	3.38	3.54	4.05	4.20	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	3.95	4.16	4.18	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	473/1579	4.43	3.74	4.08	4.21	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	978/1518	4.38	4.21	4.43	4.51	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	890/1520	4.75	4.35	4.70	4.75	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	758/1517	4.38	3.96	4.27	4.34	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	875/1550	4.29	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.69	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.50	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 435H 0101
 Title CPX CARBOHYDRATES
 Instructor: BUSH, C. ALLEN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 368
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	5.00	3.87	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	415/1639	4.60	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	230/1397	4.80	3.93	4.28	4.38	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1465/1583	3.33	3.70	4.19	4.31	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.83	4.01	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.54	4.05	4.20	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	882/1612	4.20	3.95	4.16	4.18	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1579	4.60	3.74	4.08	4.21	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.21	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.35	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	239/1517	4.80	3.96	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/1550	4.80	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	221/1295	4.60	3.69	3.94	4.01	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.50	4.07	4.23	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.91	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	944/1388	4.00	3.45	4.28	4.50	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	917/ 958	2.50	3.45	3.93	4.24	2.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 437 0101
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM
 Instructor: KARPEL, RICHARD (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 164
 Questionnaires: 84

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 369
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	3	3	9	24	43	4.23	909/1639	4.23	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	16	28	31	3.94	1210/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.29	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	6	14	28	30	3.90	1086/1397	3.90	3.93	4.28	4.38	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	64	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	****/1583	****	3.70	4.19	4.31	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	8	6	7	22	15	22	3.56	1212/1532	3.56	3.83	4.01	4.07	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	65	1	2	3	1	8	3.87	****/1504	****	3.54	4.05	4.20	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	4	5	28	39	4.18	903/1612	4.18	3.95	4.16	4.18	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	80	4.99	133/1635	4.99	4.76	4.65	4.72	4.99	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	10	10	32	15	3	2.87	1516/1579	3.55	3.74	4.08	4.21	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	7	10	16	23	25	3.60	1404/1518	4.24	4.21	4.43	4.51	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	3	9	14	23	30	3.86	1449/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.75	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	11	16	31	11	10	2.91	1472/1517	3.74	3.96	4.27	4.34	3.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	9	11	20	18	21	3.39	1370/1550	4.05	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	9	6	7	11	18	26	3.75	838/1295	4.16	3.69	3.94	4.01	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	8	2	4	0	3	2.29	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	1	0	8	5	3	3.53	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	67	0	3	2	6	3	3	3.06	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.50	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	67	16	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	83	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	83	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 26	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 27		Graduate 15
56-83	12	2.00-2.99 6	C 17	General	1
84-150	29	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		Under-grad 69
Grad.	15	3.50-4.00 28	F 0	Electives	2
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	69
			? 3		

Course-Section: CHEM 437 0101
 Title COMPREHENSIVE BIOCHEM
 Instructor: GARVIE, COLIN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 164
 Questionnaires: 84

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 370
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	3	3	9	24	43	4.23	909/1639	4.23	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	16	28	31	3.94	1210/1639	3.94	4.00	4.22	4.29	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	6	14	28	30	3.90	1086/1397	3.90	3.93	4.28	4.38	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	64	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	****/1583	****	3.70	4.19	4.31	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	8	6	7	22	15	22	3.56	1212/1532	3.56	3.83	4.01	4.07	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	65	1	2	3	1	8	3.87	****/1504	****	3.54	4.05	4.20	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	4	5	28	39	4.18	903/1612	4.18	3.95	4.16	4.18	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	80	4.99	133/1635	4.99	4.76	4.65	4.72	4.99	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	0	1	10	29	28	4.24	680/1579	3.55	3.74	4.08	4.21	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	5	68	4.88	242/1518	4.24	4.21	4.43	4.51	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	3	8	64	4.81	776/1520	4.34	4.35	4.70	4.75	4.34	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	4	21	47	4.56	523/1517	3.74	3.96	4.27	4.34	3.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	16	55	4.70	414/1550	4.05	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	6	0	2	5	13	46	4.56	238/1295	4.16	3.69	3.94	4.01	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	8	2	4	0	3	2.29	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	1	0	8	5	3	3.53	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	67	0	3	2	6	3	3	3.06	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.50	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	67	16	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	83	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	83	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 219	****	4.50	4.44	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	26	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	15	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	6	C	17	General	1	Under-grad	69	Non-major	80
84-150	29	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	15	3.50-4.00	28	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	69				
				?	3						

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 371
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	188/1639	4.71	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	142/1639	4.86	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	97/1397	4.89	3.93	4.28	4.38	4.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	228/1583	4.81	3.70	4.19	4.31	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	2	4	7	3.75	1046/1532	4.04	3.83	4.01	4.07	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	478/1504	4.59	3.54	4.05	4.20	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	207/1612	4.88	3.95	4.16	4.18	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	134/1579	4.43	3.74	4.08	4.21	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.51	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	328/1520	4.54	4.35	4.70	4.75	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	173/1517	4.84	3.96	4.27	4.34	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	104/1550	4.80	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	92/1295	4.88	3.69	3.94	4.01	4.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1398	4.86	3.50	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.91	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1388	4.79	3.45	4.28	4.50	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 958	4.25	3.45	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	23/ 224	4.76	4.04	4.10	4.49	4.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	28/ 240	4.92	4.24	4.11	4.26	4.85	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	118/ 219	4.77	4.50	4.44	4.42	4.54	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	26/ 215	4.92	4.28	4.35	4.28	4.92	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	66/ 198	4.65	4.18	4.18	4.21	4.46	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	2						

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0101
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: BLOCKLIN, ADRIA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 372
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	188/1639	4.71	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	142/1639	4.86	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	97/1397	4.89	3.93	4.28	4.38	4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	228/1583	4.81	3.70	4.19	4.31	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	0	2	4	7	3.75	1046/1532	4.04	3.83	4.01	4.07	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	478/1504	4.59	3.54	4.05	4.20	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	207/1612	4.88	3.95	4.16	4.18	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1133/1579	4.43	3.74	4.08	4.21	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	3	0	2	0	0	1.80	1514/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.51	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1500/1520	4.54	4.35	4.70	4.75	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/1517	4.84	3.96	4.27	4.34	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	2	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1550	4.80	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1398	4.86	3.50	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.91	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1388	4.79	3.45	4.28	4.50	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 958	4.25	3.45	3.93	4.24	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	23/ 224	4.76	4.04	4.10	4.49	4.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	28/ 240	4.92	4.24	4.11	4.26	4.85
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	118/ 219	4.77	4.50	4.44	4.42	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	26/ 215	4.92	4.28	4.35	4.28	4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	66/ 198	4.65	4.18	4.18	4.21	4.46

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 17		
				? 2			

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: TRACY, ALLISON (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 373
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	582/1639	4.71	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	170/1639	4.86	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	202/1397	4.89	3.93	4.28	4.38	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	168/1583	4.81	3.70	4.19	4.31	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	0	9	4.33	506/1532	4.04	3.83	4.01	4.07	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	176/1504	4.59	3.54	4.05	4.20	4.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1612	4.88	3.95	4.16	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	134/1579	4.43	3.74	4.08	4.21	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	191/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.51	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	4.54	4.35	4.70	4.75	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	214/1517	4.84	3.96	4.27	4.34	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	457/1550	4.80	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	82/1295	4.88	3.69	3.94	4.01	4.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	294/1398	4.86	3.50	4.07	4.23	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.91	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	435/1388	4.79	3.45	4.28	4.50	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	349/ 958	4.25	3.45	3.93	4.24	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	42/ 224	4.76	4.04	4.10	4.49	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 240	4.92	4.24	4.11	4.26	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 219	4.77	4.50	4.44	4.42	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	29/ 215	4.92	4.28	4.35	4.28	4.92	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	17/ 198	4.65	4.18	4.18	4.21	4.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 13
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 2	Electives 0
					Other 12

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 437L 0201
 Title BIOCHEMISTRY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SEE, BEE KOON (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 374
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	582/1639	4.71	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	170/1639	4.86	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	202/1397	4.89	3.93	4.28	4.38	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	168/1583	4.81	3.70	4.19	4.31	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	0	9	4.33	506/1532	4.04	3.83	4.01	4.07	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	176/1504	4.59	3.54	4.05	4.20	4.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1612	4.88	3.95	4.16	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	601/1579	4.43	3.74	4.08	4.21	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	4.18	4.21	4.43	4.51	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.54	4.35	4.70	4.75	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	239/1517	4.84	3.96	4.27	4.34	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1550	4.80	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1295	4.88	3.69	3.94	4.01	4.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	294/1398	4.86	3.50	4.07	4.23	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.91	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	435/1388	4.79	3.45	4.28	4.50	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	349/ 958	4.25	3.45	3.93	4.24	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	42/ 224	4.76	4.04	4.10	4.49	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 240	4.92	4.24	4.11	4.26	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 219	4.77	4.50	4.44	4.42	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	29/ 215	4.92	4.28	4.35	4.28	4.92	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	17/ 198	4.65	4.18	4.18	4.21	4.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 13
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 2	Other 12

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: CHEM 451 0101
 Title MECH OF ORGANIC REACTI
 Instructor: SMITH, PAUL J.
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 375
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	529/1639	4.59	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	15	12	4.31	800/1639	4.31	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	8	14	4.21	841/1397	4.21	3.93	4.28	4.38	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	939/1583	4.10	3.70	4.19	4.31	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	4	4	8	8	3.62	1176/1532	3.62	3.83	4.01	4.07	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	3	8	7	3.95	884/1504	3.95	3.54	4.05	4.20	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	5	4	17	4.29	779/1612	4.29	3.95	4.16	4.18	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	26	2	4.07	1466/1635	4.07	4.76	4.65	4.72	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	13	11	4.30	612/1579	4.30	3.74	4.08	4.21	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	510/1518	4.72	4.21	4.43	4.51	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	571/1520	4.90	4.35	4.70	4.75	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	10	14	4.31	822/1517	4.31	3.96	4.27	4.34	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	500/1550	4.62	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	2	1	3	4	6	3.69	882/1295	3.69	3.69	3.94	4.01	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	0	2	4	4	3.46	1128/1398	3.46	3.50	4.07	4.23	3.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	778/1391	4.31	3.91	4.30	4.48	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	4	1	6	3.69	1116/1388	3.69	3.45	4.28	4.50	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	8	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.24	4.11	4.26	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.85	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	9	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	10	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	2						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: CHEM 470 0101
 Title TOXICOLOGICAL CHEMISTR
 Instructor: FISHBEIN, JAMES
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 376
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	205/1639	4.87	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	0	8	6	4.20	915/1639	4.20	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	271/1397	4.77	3.93	4.28	4.38	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	444/1583	4.53	3.70	4.19	4.31	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	1	5	6	3.73	1069/1532	3.73	3.83	4.01	4.07	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	920/1504	3.93	3.54	4.05	4.20	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	779/1612	4.29	3.95	4.16	4.18	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1288/1635	4.33	4.76	4.65	4.72	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	473/1579	4.43	3.74	4.08	4.21	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	491/1518	4.73	4.21	4.43	4.51	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.35	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	999/1517	4.13	3.96	4.27	4.34	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	122/1550	4.93	3.87	4.22	4.24	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	929/1295	3.60	3.69	3.94	4.01	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: CHEM 490A 0101
 Title DYNAMICS AND MECHANISM
 Instructor: ARNOLD, BRADLEY
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 377
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	3.87	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	3.93	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1583	5.00	3.70	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	178/1532	4.75	3.83	4.01	4.07	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.54	4.05	4.20	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1612	5.00	3.95	4.16	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1579	5.00	3.74	4.08	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.21	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.35	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	3.96	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	3.87	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.69	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	3.50	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	3.91	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	3.45	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.45	3.93	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: CHEM 490B 0101
 Title NANOPARTICLES
 Instructor: MARIE-CHRISTINE
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 378
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	3.87	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	3.93	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1583	5.00	3.70	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1532	****	3.83	4.01	4.07	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.54	4.05	4.20	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	814/1612	4.25	3.95	4.16	4.18	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.76	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1579	5.00	3.74	4.08	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.21	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.35	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	3.96	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	3.87	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1295	5.00	3.69	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	****	3.50	4.07	4.23	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	3.91	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	****	3.45	4.28	4.50	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.45	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

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