

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	37
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	6	4	2	3.06	1414/1449	3.06	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	5	3	2	3	2.81	1425/1446	2.81	4.03	4.29	4.20	2.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	2	2	3	5	3.50	1163/1256	3.50	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	2	4	3	3	3.07	1357/1402	3.07	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	1	2	4	1	2.75	1331/1358	2.75	3.89	4.13	4.04	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	3	4	3	3.00	1264/1327	3.00	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	5	4	2	1	2.53	1413/1435	2.53	3.91	4.20	4.11	2.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	586/1446	4.88	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	4	3	3	0	2.58	1413/1437	2.58	3.90	4.12	4.04	2.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	3	1	3	3	2.86	1375/1386	2.86	4.33	4.48	4.40	2.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	855/1390	4.77	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	1	5	2	3.07	1335/1379	3.07	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	2	4	1	3	2.79	1353/1379	2.79	4.08	4.36	4.26	2.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1144/1236	3.00	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1099/1121	2.50	3.61	4.18	3.89	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	996/1122	3.60	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	809/1121	4.17	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	37
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	46

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	15	15	12	3.74	1272/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	13	14	13	3.70	1261/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	5	10	17	10	3.64	1135/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	4	5	7	11	6	3.30	1325/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	9	5	5	8	11	5	3.18	1278/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	21	5	1	7	7	3	3.09	1254/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	1	12	12	16	3.84	1109/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	0	0	8	24	8	4.00	1354/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	3	3	5	19	9	3	3.10	1359/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	4	3	9	8	18	3.79	1262/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	3	0	5	12	22	4.19	1292/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	6	6	8	5	16	3.46	1274/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	4	6	5	6	9	12	3.42	1284/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	9	4	9	3	11	3.08	1137/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	7	5	13	14	3.55	918/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	5	6	12	19	3.93	903/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	3	9	8	18	3.66	980/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.66
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	3	3	6	11	16	3.87	512/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.87

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	46

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3 A 10	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 15						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3 C 13	General	4	Under-grad	46	Non-major	45
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2 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	1				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	46

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

? 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	46

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	15	15	12	3.74	1272/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	13	14	13	3.70	1261/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	5	10	17	10	3.64	1135/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	4	5	7	11	6	3.30	1325/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	9	5	5	8	11	5	3.18	1278/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	21	5	1	7	7	3	3.09	1254/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	1	12	12	16	3.84	1109/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	0	0	8	24	8	4.00	1354/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	4	1	3	9	14	4	3.55	1227/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	1	3	4	6	12	3.96	1200/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	3	2	8	14	4.22	1284/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	2	3	5	8	9	3.70	1209/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	3	1	6	6	8	3.63	1225/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	2	2	4	8	4	6	3.33	1078/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	7	5	13	14	3.55	918/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	5	6	12	19	3.93	903/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	3	9	8	18	3.66	980/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.66
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	3	3	6	11	16	3.87	512/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.87

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	46

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3 A 10	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 15						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3 C 13	General	4	Under-grad	46	Non-major	45
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2 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	1				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	46

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

? 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	46

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	15	15	12	3.74	1272/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	13	14	13	3.70	1261/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	5	10	17	10	3.64	1135/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	4	5	7	11	6	3.30	1325/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	9	5	5	8	11	5	3.18	1278/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	21	5	1	7	7	3	3.09	1254/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	1	12	12	16	3.84	1109/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	0	0	8	24	8	4.00	1354/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	4	0	0	6	14	8	4.07	822/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	1052/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	1262/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	635/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	1053/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	1	2	0	5	5	6	3.72	926/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	7	5	13	14	3.55	918/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	5	6	12	19	3.93	903/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	6	3	9	8	18	3.66	980/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.66
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	3	3	6	11	16	3.87	512/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.87

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	46

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	42	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	42	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	3 A 10	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 15						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3 C 13	General	4	Under-grad	46	Non-major	45
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2 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	1				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	63
Questionnaires:	46

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

? 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	2	10	8	13	3.80	1237/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	13	11	8	3.63	1289/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	5	10	10	7	3.44	1179/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	3	2	10	6	7	3.43	1299/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	8	8	8	5	3.34	1228/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	13	3	1	5	9	3	3.38	1177/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	2	2	7	8	14	3.91	1060/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	7	17	7	4.00	1354/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	2	2	10	8	4	3.38	1294/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	1	6	7	17	4.00	1177/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	3	1	4	14	12	3.91	1341/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	5	2	6	9	10	3.53	1254/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	4	2	6	8	13	3.73	1193/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	3	2	7	7	7	3.50	1012/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	7	4	12	4.04	716/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	2	7	14	4.32	699/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	10	8	6	3.83	940/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	7	4	12	4.22	353/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	4.22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	****/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	****/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 03	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 72
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I		Questionnaires: 37
Instructor: Olson,Wendy J.		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons			Type	Majors				
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	7	Under-grad	36	Non-major	37
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	2	10	8	13	3.80	1237/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	13	11	8	3.63	1289/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	5	10	10	7	3.44	1179/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	3	2	10	6	7	3.43	1299/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	8	8	8	5	3.34	1228/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	13	3	1	5	9	3	3.38	1177/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	2	2	7	8	14	3.91	1060/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	7	17	7	4.00	1354/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	3	9	7	4	3.52	1236/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	1	0	5	4	10	4.10	1145/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	1276/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	1	1	8	5	3	3.44	1281/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	7	4	6	3.68	1207/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	2	1	11	2	6	3.41	1052/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	7	4	12	4.04	716/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	2	7	14	4.32	699/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	10	8	6	3.83	940/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	7	4	12	4.22	353/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	4.22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	****/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	****/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment:	72
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I		Questionnaires:	37
Instructor:	Hamilton,Diana			

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	7	Under-grad	36	Non-major	37
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	2	10	8	13	3.80	1237/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	13	11	8	3.63	1289/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	5	10	10	7	3.44	1179/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	3	2	10	6	7	3.43	1299/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	8	8	8	5	3.34	1228/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	13	3	1	5	9	3	3.38	1177/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	2	2	7	8	14	3.91	1060/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	7	17	7	4.00	1354/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	4	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	809/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	****/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	****/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	2	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	****/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	7	4	12	4.04	716/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	2	7	14	4.32	699/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	10	8	6	3.83	940/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	7	4	12	4.22	353/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	4.22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	****/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	****/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 101 03	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 72
Title: Prin Of Chemistry I		Questionnaires: 37
Instructor: Audino, Jacquely		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	7	Under-grad	36	Non-major	37
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	2	10	8	13	3.80	1237/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	13	11	8	3.63	1289/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	5	10	10	7	3.44	1179/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	6	3	2	10	6	7	3.43	1299/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	8	8	8	5	3.34	1228/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	13	3	1	5	9	3	3.38	1177/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	2	2	7	8	14	3.91	1060/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	7	17	7	4.00	1354/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	735/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	929/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	1290/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	****/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	****/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	2	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	****/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	7	4	12	4.04	716/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	2	7	14	4.32	699/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	10	8	6	3.83	940/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	7	4	12	4.22	353/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	4.22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	****/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	****/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	37

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	7	Under-grad	36	Non-major	37
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	3	7	9	3.75	1262/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	5	6	9	3.60	1297/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	2	2	14	3.76	1075/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	5	3	3	5	3	2.89	1371/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	5	8	6	3.57	1144/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	3	1	3	3	2	3.00	1264/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	3	6	9	3.71	1187/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	1	16	5	4.18	1261/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	3	3	7	3	2	2.89	1389/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	6	3	11	3.87	1243/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	3	8	10	4.09	1319/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	7	4	8	3.57	1247/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	3	3	4	8	3.41	1292/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	7	2	3	3	6	2.95	1156/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	4	7	5	3.32	998/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	4	2	2	12	3.95	890/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	2	3	6	7	3.45	1027/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	4	1	3	4	9	3.62	604/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0 A 6	Required for Majors	19
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4 C 2	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 6		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	3	7	9	3.75	1262/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	5	6	9	3.60	1297/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	2	2	14	3.76	1075/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	5	3	3	5	3	2.89	1371/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	5	8	6	3.57	1144/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	3	1	3	3	2	3.00	1264/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	3	6	9	3.71	1187/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	1	16	5	4.18	1261/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	4	6	4	1	2.88	1389/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1148/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1125/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1251/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1125/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	709/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	4	7	5	3.32	998/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	4	2	2	12	3.95	890/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	2	3	6	7	3.45	1027/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	4	1	3	4	9	3.62	604/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0 A 6	Required for Majors	19
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4 C 2	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 6		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	3	7	9	3.75	1262/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	5	6	9	3.60	1297/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	2	2	14	3.76	1075/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	5	3	3	5	3	2.89	1371/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	5	8	6	3.57	1144/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	3	1	3	3	2	3.00	1264/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	3	6	9	3.71	1187/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	1	16	5	4.18	1261/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	3	9	3	4.00	868/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	1075/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	958/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	635/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	836/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	331/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	4	7	5	3.32	998/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	4	2	2	12	3.95	890/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	2	3	6	7	3.45	1027/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	4	1	3	4	9	3.62	604/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	25

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0 A 6	Required for Majors	19
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0 B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4 C 2	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2 D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 6		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	0	7	10	3.91	1187/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	2	7	9	3.86	1174/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	0	8	10	4.10	899/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	1	1	7	5	3.59	1243/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	4	0	0	8	6	3.67	1092/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	3	2	0	3	5	3.38	1177/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	1	8	9	3.91	1060/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	1261/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	3	5	3	6	2	2.95	1377/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	1	3	5	9	3.76	1269/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	3	7	8	3.90	1343/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	6	3	6	3.29	1311/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	0	3	5	8	3.52	1249/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	4	3	1	5	3.36	1071/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	2	7	6	3.88	809/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	648/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	844/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	2	1	2	1	10	4.00	425/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	144/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	85/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	100/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	78/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	39/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	0	7	10	3.91	1187/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	2	7	9	3.86	1174/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	0	8	10	4.10	899/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	1	1	7	5	3.59	1243/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	4	0	0	8	6	3.67	1092/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	3	2	0	3	5	3.38	1177/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	1	8	9	3.91	1060/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	1261/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	1	1	7	3	3.77	1110/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	803/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	1162/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	902/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	688/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	468/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	2	7	6	3.88	809/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	648/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	844/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	2	1	2	1	10	4.00	425/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	144/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	85/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	100/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	78/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	39/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	3	0	7	10	3.91	1187/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	2	7	9	3.86	1174/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	0	8	10	4.10	899/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	1	1	7	5	3.59	1243/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	4	0	0	8	6	3.67	1092/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	3	2	0	3	5	3.38	1177/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	1	8	9	3.91	1060/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	1261/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	868/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	803/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	1216/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	832/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	688/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	468/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	2	7	6	3.88	809/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	648/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	844/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	2	1	2	1	10	4.00	425/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	144/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	85/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	100/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	78/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	39/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	0	7	10	3.91	1187/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	2	7	9	3.86	1174/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	0	8	10	4.10	899/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	3	1	1	7	5	3.59	1243/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	4	0	0	8	6	3.67	1092/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	3	2	0	3	5	3.38	1177/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	1	8	9	3.91	1060/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	1261/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	816/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	916/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	1192/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	832/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	688/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	468/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	2	7	6	3.88	809/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	648/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	844/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	2	1	2	1	10	4.00	425/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	144/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	85/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	100/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	78/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	39/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	51
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	8	4	13	14	13	3.38	1380/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	8	5	15	14	10	3.25	1388/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	7	5	11	17	12	3.42	1184/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	12	6	6	13	5	10	3.18	1342/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	7	6	3	17	9	8	3.23	1263/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	22	5	4	7	4	7	3.15	1244/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	7	3	16	10	13	3.39	1301/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	0	7	29	11	4.02	1346/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.02
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	6	8	11	9	2	2.81	1399/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	9	2	10	11	18	3.54	1314/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	9	4	9	9	20	3.53	1374/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	3.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	9	5	13	8	16	3.33	1304/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	11	1	9	8	17	3.41	1288/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	8	8	2	6	8	12	3.39	1059/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	12	1	7	6	13	3.18	1031/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	9	2	8	6	12	3.27	1041/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	13	3	9	4	7	2.69	1101/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.69
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	7	5	4	3	12	3.26	697/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.26

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	****/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	2	0	5	1	2	3.10	****/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	****/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	****/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	2	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	****/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	2	Under-grad	55	Non-major	53
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	8	4	13	14	13	3.38	1380/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	8	5	15	14	10	3.25	1388/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	7	5	11	17	12	3.42	1184/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	12	6	6	13	5	10	3.18	1342/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	7	6	3	17	9	8	3.23	1263/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	22	5	4	7	4	7	3.15	1244/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	7	3	16	10	13	3.39	1301/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	0	7	29	11	4.02	1346/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.02
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	0	8	3	13	5	0	2.52	1418/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	6	2	3	0	13	3.50	1319/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	5	2	1	1	15	3.79	1355/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	3.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	6	4	4	4	7	3.08	1335/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	31	0	9	1	5	1	8	2.92	1346/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	4	5	1	2	5	8	3.48	1024/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	12	1	7	6	13	3.18	1031/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	9	2	8	6	12	3.27	1041/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	13	3	9	4	7	2.69	1101/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.69
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	7	5	4	3	12	3.26	697/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.26

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	****/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	2	0	5	1	2	3.10	****/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	****/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	****/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	2	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	****/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	2	Under-grad	55	Non-major	53
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	8	4	13	14	13	3.38	1380/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	8	5	15	14	10	3.25	1388/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	7	5	11	17	12	3.42	1184/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	12	6	6	13	5	10	3.18	1342/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	7	6	3	17	9	8	3.23	1263/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	22	5	4	7	4	7	3.15	1244/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	7	3	16	10	13	3.39	1301/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	0	7	29	11	4.02	1346/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.02
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	0	0	1	8	7	9	3.96	927/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	39	0	2	0	3	2	9	4.00	1177/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	41	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	1097/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	3.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	39	0	2	1	1	4	8	3.94	1104/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	40	0	2	2	3	0	8	3.67	1213/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	40	4	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	****/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	12	1	7	6	13	3.18	1031/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	9	2	8	6	12	3.27	1041/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	13	3	9	4	7	2.69	1101/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.69
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	7	5	4	3	12	3.26	697/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.26

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	****/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	2	0	5	1	2	3.10	****/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	****/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	****/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	2	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	****/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	2	Under-grad	55	Non-major	53
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	8	4	13	14	13	3.38	1380/1449	3.71	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	8	5	15	14	10	3.25	1388/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	7	5	11	17	12	3.42	1184/1256	3.67	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	12	6	6	13	5	10	3.18	1342/1402	3.30	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	7	6	3	17	9	8	3.23	1263/1358	3.40	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	22	5	4	7	4	7	3.15	1244/1327	3.22	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	7	3	16	10	13	3.39	1301/1435	3.75	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	0	7	29	11	4.02	1346/1446	4.08	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.02
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	0	2	1	10	3	9	3.64	1181/1437	3.52	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	40	0	2	0	1	2	10	4.20	1090/1386	4.06	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	41	0	2	0	1	3	8	4.07	1321/1390	4.21	4.50	4.74	4.67	3.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	39	0	2	0	1	4	9	4.13	1003/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	40	0	2	1	3	0	9	3.87	1140/1379	3.81	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	40	4	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	****/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	12	1	7	6	13	3.18	1031/1121	3.61	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	9	2	8	6	12	3.27	1041/1122	3.98	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	13	3	9	4	7	2.69	1101/1121	3.54	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.69
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	7	5	4	3	12	3.26	697/790	3.80	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.26

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	0	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	****/200	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	2	0	5	1	2	3.10	****/205	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	****/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	****/202	4.63	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	2	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	****/196	4.67	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	53	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	53	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 101 06
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry I
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	55

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	52	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	52	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	2	Under-grad	55	Non-major	53
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	1	12	14	6	3.46	1367/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	4	4	8	14	7	3.43	1349/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	7	2	9	10	8	3.28	1209/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	4	1	11	9	2	3.15	1347/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	3	2	8	13	6	3.53	1159/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	19	3	2	7	5	0	2.82	1296/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	2.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	3	1	7	13	12	3.83	1118/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	0	18	16	4.40	1095/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	2	4	11	8	2	3.15	1353/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	3	4	4	8	15	3.82	1251/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	2	1	5	7	20	4.20	1290/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	3	4	5	16	5	3.48	1267/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	4	2	4	11	11	3.72	1197/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	3	1	9	11	5	3.48	1020/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	7	1	4	10	6	3.25	1012/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	0	5	6	14	4.00	857/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	5	2	5	9	8	3.45	1029/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	3	1	10	4	9	3.56	625/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	1	12	14	6	3.46	1367/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	4	4	8	14	7	3.43	1349/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	7	2	9	10	8	3.28	1209/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	4	1	11	9	2	3.15	1347/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	3	2	8	13	6	3.53	1159/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	19	3	2	7	5	0	2.82	1296/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	2.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	3	1	7	13	12	3.83	1118/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	0	18	16	4.40	1095/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	5	5	6	8	0	2.71	1408/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	4	1	1	3	13	3.91	1235/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	3	1	2	5	12	3.96	1337/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	4	2	4	7	4	3.24	1318/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	1	3	2	3	3	10	3.71	1197/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	4	3	0	5	5	7	3.65	959/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	7	1	4	10	6	3.25	1012/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	0	5	6	14	4.00	857/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	5	2	5	9	8	3.45	1029/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	3	1	10	4	9	3.56	625/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Audino,Jacquely

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	1	12	14	6	3.46	1367/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	4	4	8	14	7	3.43	1349/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	7	2	9	10	8	3.28	1209/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	4	1	11	9	2	3.15	1347/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	3	2	8	13	6	3.53	1159/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	19	3	2	7	5	0	2.82	1296/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	2.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	3	1	7	13	12	3.83	1118/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	0	18	16	4.40	1095/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	2	0	4	6	3	3	3.31	1318/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	****/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	1125/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	31	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	****/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	1	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	****/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	3	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	****/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	7	1	4	10	6	3.25	1012/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	0	5	6	14	4.00	857/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	5	2	5	9	8	3.45	1029/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	3	1	10	4	9	3.56	625/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Audino, Jacquely

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Audino, Jacquely

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	1	12	14	6	3.46	1367/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	4	4	8	14	7	3.43	1349/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	7	2	9	10	8	3.28	1209/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	10	4	1	11	9	2	3.15	1347/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	3	2	8	13	6	3.53	1159/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	19	3	2	7	5	0	2.82	1296/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	2.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	3	1	7	13	12	3.83	1118/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	0	18	16	4.40	1095/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	2	0	2	2	8	6	4.00	868/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	****/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	****/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	****/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	****/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	3	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	7	1	4	10	6	3.25	1012/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	3	0	5	6	14	4.00	857/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	5	2	5	9	8	3.45	1029/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	3	1	10	4	9	3.56	625/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 02
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	69
Questionnaires:	41

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	41	Non-major	40
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	10	8	9	7	4	2.66	1439/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	2.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	3	11	8	8	3.13	1404/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	2	10	8	8	3.11	1230/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	7	2	4	4	2	2.58	1388/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	2.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	8	3	6	11	4	3.00	1296/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	6	2	4	3	1	2.44	1316/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	2.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	9	12	12	3.81	1134/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	1	0	3	14	15	4.27	1197/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	7	5	9	8	2	2.77	1401/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	9	2	9	6	11	3.22	1355/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	6	4	8	5	12	3.37	1377/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	11	3	9	5	8	2.89	1351/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	12	4	7	4	7	2.71	1358/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	7	2	7	5	8	3.17	1124/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	2.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	11	0	8	9	2	2.70	1083/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	2.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	3	6	7	11	3.67	979/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	10	1	11	2	6	2.77	1097/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.77
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	8	5	3	8	5	2.90	759/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	2.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	38

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	5	Under-grad	38	Non-major	34
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	10	8	9	7	4	2.66	1439/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	2.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	3	11	8	8	3.13	1404/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	2	10	8	8	3.11	1230/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	7	2	4	4	2	2.58	1388/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	2.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	8	3	6	11	4	3.00	1296/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	6	2	4	3	1	2.44	1316/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	2.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	9	12	12	3.81	1134/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	1	0	3	14	15	4.27	1197/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	7	2	9	11	2	2.97	1373/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	4	0	3	3	8	3.61	1305/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	4	0	5	3	10	3.68	1365/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	8	0	4	3	3	2.61	1369/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	7	2	2	3	2	2.44	1372/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	3	8	2	1	3	1	2.13	1226/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	2.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	11	0	8	9	2	2.70	1083/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	2.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	3	6	7	11	3.67	979/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	10	1	11	2	6	2.77	1097/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.77
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	8	5	3	8	5	2.90	759/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	2.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	38

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	5	Under-grad	38	Non-major	34
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	10	8	9	7	4	2.66	1439/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	2.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	3	11	8	8	3.13	1404/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	2	10	8	8	3.11	1230/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	7	2	4	4	2	2.58	1388/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	2.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	8	3	6	11	4	3.00	1296/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	6	2	4	3	1	2.44	1316/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	2.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	9	12	12	3.81	1134/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	1	0	3	14	15	4.27	1197/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	5	2	6	13	4	3.30	1322/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	3	1	2	1	4	3.18	1358/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	3	0	5	1	7	3.56	1372/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	3	0	2	1	5	3.45	1278/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	3	1	3	0	4	3.09	1332/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	4	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	****/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	2.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	11	0	8	9	2	2.70	1083/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	2.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	3	6	7	11	3.67	979/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	10	1	11	2	6	2.77	1097/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.77
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	8	5	3	8	5	2.90	759/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	2.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	38

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	5	Under-grad	38	Non-major	34
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	38

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	10	8	9	7	4	2.66	1439/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	2.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	3	11	8	8	3.13	1404/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	9	2	10	8	8	3.11	1230/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	7	2	4	4	2	2.58	1388/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	2.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	8	3	6	11	4	3.00	1296/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	6	2	4	3	1	2.44	1316/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	2.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	9	12	12	3.81	1134/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	4	1	0	3	14	15	4.27	1197/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	10	10	9	3.90	1016/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	27	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	1101/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	1	0	5	1	9	4.06	1322/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	702/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	2	3	0	6	3.91	1125/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	3	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	****/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	2.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	11	0	8	9	2	2.70	1083/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	2.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	3	6	7	11	3.67	979/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	10	1	11	2	6	2.77	1097/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.77
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	8	5	3	8	5	2.90	759/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	2.90

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 03
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	68
Questionnaires:	38

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	5	Under-grad	38	Non-major	34
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	3	4	12	8	3.63	1316/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	2	5	10	10	3.83	1197/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	3	6	12	7	3.72	1097/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	1	2	9	6	5	3.52	1266/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	8	12	5	3.57	1139/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	10	4	0	5	4	5	3.33	1196/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	5	10	10	3.96	1006/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	12	14	4.54	998/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	5	12	5	3.62	1196/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	2	2	2	3	14	4.09	1151/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	1125/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	3	2	6	9	3.90	1124/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	2	3	3	4	9	3.71	1197/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	3	1	4	3	8	3.63	967/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	2	3	7	8	3.77	846/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	6	3	13	4.32	708/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	9	5	5	3.45	1027/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	3	3	3	4	8	3.52	635/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	31

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 7	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	4	12	8	3.63	1316/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	2	5	10	10	3.83	1197/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	3	6	12	7	3.72	1097/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	1	2	9	6	5	3.52	1266/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	8	12	5	3.57	1139/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	10	4	0	5	4	5	3.33	1196/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	5	10	10	3.96	1006/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	12	14	4.54	998/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	3	11	8	2	3.28	1326/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1253/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	1308/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	1	2	7	4	3.80	1172/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	4	3	3	3	3.38	1295/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	963/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	2	3	7	8	3.77	846/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	6	3	13	4.32	708/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	9	5	5	3.45	1027/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	3	3	3	4	8	3.52	635/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	31

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 9 Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 7 General 1	Under-grad 31	Non-major 31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0 Electives 0 P 0 I 0 Other 0 ? 8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	4	12	8	3.63	1316/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	2	5	10	10	3.83	1197/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	3	6	12	7	3.72	1097/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	1	2	9	6	5	3.52	1266/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	8	12	5	3.57	1139/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	10	4	0	5	4	5	3.33	1196/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	5	10	10	3.96	1006/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	12	14	4.54	998/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	1	1	11	8	4.09	809/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	989/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1088/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	702/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1053/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	1	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	678/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	2	3	7	8	3.77	846/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	6	3	13	4.32	708/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	9	5	5	3.45	1027/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	3	3	3	4	8	3.52	635/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	31

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 7	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	31

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	4	12	8	3.63	1316/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	2	5	10	10	3.83	1197/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	3	6	12	7	3.72	1097/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	1	2	9	6	5	3.52	1266/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	8	12	5	3.57	1139/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	10	4	0	5	4	5	3.33	1196/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	5	10	10	3.96	1006/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	12	14	4.54	998/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	0	1	9	6	3	3.58	1214/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	1145/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1270/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1124/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1163/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	1	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	882/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	2	3	7	8	3.77	846/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	6	3	13	4.32	708/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	9	5	5	3.45	1027/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.45
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	3	3	3	4	8	3.52	635/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.52

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 04
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	71
Questionnaires:	31

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 9 Required for Majors	24 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 7 General	1	Under-grad 31 Non-major 31
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 8 Electives Other	0 0 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	4	7	12	3.76	1262/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	6	6	9	3.41	1355/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	4	5	5	9	3.24	1215/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	1	3	2	4	5	3.60	1236/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	2	4	7	3	7	3.39	1208/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	2	2	6	3	2	3.07	1256/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	5	7	5	10	3.64	1220/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	18	8	4.31	1176/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	6	1	5	9	3	3.08	1360/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	4	5	0	4	12	3.60	1307/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	4	1	5	13	4.04	1325/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	6	4	2	5	8	3.20	1323/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	2	6	2	3	4	8	3.26	1313/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	6	3	2	4	7	3.14	1130/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	1	3	10	2	3.14	1039/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	1	1	5	11	3.95	890/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	2	4	6	6	3.48	1021/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.48
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	4	1	2	5	7	3.53	635/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.53

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	4	7	12	3.76	1262/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	6	6	9	3.41	1355/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	4	5	5	9	3.24	1215/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	1	3	2	4	5	3.60	1236/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	2	4	7	3	7	3.39	1208/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	2	2	6	3	2	3.07	1256/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	5	7	5	10	3.64	1220/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	18	8	4.31	1176/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	3	0	8	8	2	3.29	1326/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	2	0	1	4	6	3.92	1223/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	1	1	1	3	9	4.20	1290/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	2	1	1	6	3	3.54	1254/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	0	1	6	3	3.46	1269/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	0	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	1098/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	1	3	10	2	3.14	1039/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	1	1	5	11	3.95	890/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	2	4	6	6	3.48	1021/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.48
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	4	1	2	5	7	3.53	635/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.53

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Audino, Jacquely

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	3	4	7	12	3.76	1262/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	6	6	9	3.41	1355/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	4	5	5	9	3.24	1215/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	1	3	2	4	5	3.60	1236/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	2	4	7	3	7	3.39	1208/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	2	2	6	3	2	3.07	1256/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	5	7	5	10	3.64	1220/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	18	8	4.31	1176/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	3	2	7	6	1	3.00	1364/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	1101/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1373/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	3	0	1	4	3	3.36	1300/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	2	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1182/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	1	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	****/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	1	3	10	2	3.14	1039/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	1	1	5	11	3.95	890/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	2	4	6	6	3.48	1021/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.48
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	4	1	2	5	7	3.53	635/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.53

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Audino, Jacquely

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	4	7	12	3.76	1262/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	6	6	9	3.41	1355/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	4	5	5	9	3.24	1215/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	13	1	3	2	4	5	3.60	1236/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	2	4	7	3	7	3.39	1208/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	2	2	6	3	2	3.07	1256/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	5	7	5	10	3.64	1220/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	18	8	4.31	1176/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	321/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	691/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	1134/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	599/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	956/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	1	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	709/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	5	1	3	10	2	3.14	1039/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	1	1	5	11	3.95	890/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	2	4	6	6	3.48	1021/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.48
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	4	1	2	5	7	3.53	635/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.53

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 05
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	61
Questionnaires:	30

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	2	Under-grad	30	Non-major	29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	9	9	8	3.82	1227/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	8	9	7	3.64	1281/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	6	10	7	3.81	1054/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	5	3	9	3	3.38	1309/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	6	7	8	3.62	1118/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	4	3	6	2	3.25	1220/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	6	4	6	11	3.81	1134/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	776/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	2	4	8	6	3.64	1186/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	6	6	12	4.04	1167/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	6	2	18	4.46	1186/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	1	5	8	8	3.68	1214/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	4	5	11	3.92	1117/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	3	1	6	5	9	3.67	954/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	5	9	4	3.62	896/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	781/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	3	9	7	3.95	887/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	2	2	4	7	6	3.62	604/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/200	****	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/205	****	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/201	****	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/196	****	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 5	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	9	9	8	3.82	1227/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	8	9	7	3.64	1281/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	6	10	7	3.81	1054/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	5	3	9	3	3.38	1309/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	6	7	8	3.62	1118/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	4	3	6	2	3.25	1220/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	6	4	6	11	3.81	1134/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	776/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	3	5	6	4	3.61	1196/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	1045/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	1047/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	946/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	1027/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	1	0	4	3	7	4.00	709/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	5	9	4	3.62	896/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	781/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	3	9	7	3.95	887/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	2	2	4	7	6	3.62	604/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/200	****	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/205	****	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/201	****	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/196	****	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	16 Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 5	General	3 Under-grad 28 Non-major 26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	9	9	8	3.82	1227/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	8	9	7	3.64	1281/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	6	10	7	3.81	1054/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	5	3	9	3	3.38	1309/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	6	7	8	3.62	1118/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	4	3	6	2	3.25	1220/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	6	4	6	11	3.81	1134/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	776/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	2	0	5	5	5	3.65	1181/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1177/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1340/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1205/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	5	1	5	3.62	1228/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	904/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	5	9	4	3.62	896/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	781/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	3	9	7	3.95	887/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	2	2	4	7	6	3.62	604/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/200	****	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/205	****	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/201	****	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/196	****	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Crouse,Cortney

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	16 Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 5	General	3 Under-grad 28 Non-major 26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	9	9	8	3.82	1227/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	8	9	7	3.64	1281/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	6	10	7	3.81	1054/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	5	3	9	3	3.38	1309/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	6	7	8	3.62	1118/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	1	4	3	6	2	3.25	1220/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	6	4	6	11	3.81	1134/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	776/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	956/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	1223/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	1262/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1030/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	6	2	5	3.92	1110/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	709/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	5	9	4	3.62	896/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	781/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	3	9	7	3.95	887/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	2	2	4	7	6	3.62	604/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.62

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/200	****	4.37	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/205	****	4.48	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/201	****	4.64	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	4.54	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/196	****	4.37	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 07
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	70
Questionnaires:	28

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0 C 5	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major	26
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	5	7	8	14	3.61	1329/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	12	10	12	3.74	1242/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	9	9	15	3.92	1008/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	3	9	3	7	3.64	1223/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	4	10	7	11	3.70	1076/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	3	5	6	5	3.55	1108/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	5	9	8	14	3.86	1093/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	0	11	21	4.58	970/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	4	2	5	7	7	3.44	1270/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	3	4	7	17	4.13	1134/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	1	4	8	17	4.26	1276/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	4	7	5	14	3.87	1138/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	2	5	5	16	4.03	1040/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	1	5	5	7	9	3.67	954/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	4	6	5	8	3.52	924/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	5	9	11	4.24	752/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	2	7	7	7	3.60	991/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	4	6	1	7	7	3.28	691/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	39

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	12	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	37
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	5	7	8	14	3.61	1329/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	12	10	12	3.74	1242/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	9	9	15	3.92	1008/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	3	9	3	7	3.64	1223/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	4	10	7	11	3.70	1076/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	3	5	6	5	3.55	1108/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	5	9	8	14	3.86	1093/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	0	11	21	4.58	970/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	2	2	8	10	2	3.33	1311/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	2	5	7	8	3.95	1206/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	1	4	8	9	4.14	1308/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	2	7	5	7	3.81	1172/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	3	5	4	7	3.65	1216/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	1	1	4	3	6	6	3.60	980/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	4	6	5	8	3.52	924/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	5	9	11	4.24	752/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	2	7	7	7	3.60	991/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	4	6	1	7	7	3.28	691/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	39

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 11 Required for Majors	27	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 12 General	1	Under-grad 39 Non-major 37
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 19	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 7		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	5	7	8	14	3.61	1329/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	12	10	12	3.74	1242/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	9	9	15	3.92	1008/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	3	9	3	7	3.64	1223/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	4	10	7	11	3.70	1076/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	3	5	6	5	3.55	1108/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	5	9	8	14	3.86	1093/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	0	11	21	4.58	970/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	1	1	6	9	4	3.67	1172/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	2	1	5	5	5	3.56	1313/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	1210/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	2	2	3	5	5	3.53	1256/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	3	2	4	3	5	3.29	1309/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	5	1	2	1	5	3	3.58	986/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	4	6	5	8	3.52	924/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	5	9	11	4.24	752/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	2	7	7	7	3.60	991/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	4	6	1	7	7	3.28	691/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	39

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	27
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 12	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 19	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 7		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	5	7	8	14	3.61	1329/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	12	10	12	3.74	1242/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	9	9	15	3.92	1008/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	3	9	3	7	3.64	1223/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	4	10	7	11	3.70	1076/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	17	1	3	5	6	5	3.55	1108/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	5	9	8	14	3.86	1093/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	1	0	11	21	4.58	970/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	2	6	8	5	3.76	1110/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	1	1	5	5	6	3.78	1265/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	4	8	7	4.16	1303/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	967/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	2	4	2	8	3.82	1155/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	5	1	3	1	5	2	3.33	1078/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	4	6	5	8	3.52	924/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	5	9	11	4.24	752/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	2	7	7	7	3.60	991/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	4	6	1	7	7	3.28	691/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.28

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 08
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	39

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	27
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 12	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 19	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 7		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	7	4	3.65	1312/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	6	4	3.59	1303/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	7	3	3.35	1196/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	0	4	3	0	2.89	1372/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	7	2	5	3.63	1113/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1248/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	2	3	7	3.81	1134/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	606/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	4	4	3.73	1131/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	0	3	10	3.94	1211/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	1025/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	1	1	2	10	3.88	1133/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	1	10	3.82	1155/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	3	5	1	6	3.67	954/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	1	4	5	3.50	931/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	612/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	855/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	526/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.85

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	17

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	7	4	3.65	1312/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	6	4	3.59	1303/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	7	3	3.35	1196/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	0	4	3	0	2.89	1372/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	7	2	5	3.63	1113/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1248/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	2	3	7	3.81	1134/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	606/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	3	1	5	1	2	2.83	1395/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	0	0	4	6	4.00	1177/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1341/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	2	6	3	3.62	1235/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1235/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	3	1	3	3	3.60	980/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	1	4	5	3.50	931/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	612/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	855/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	526/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.85

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	17

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	7	4	3.65	1312/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	6	4	3.59	1303/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	7	3	3.35	1196/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	0	4	3	0	2.89	1372/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	7	2	5	3.63	1113/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1248/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	2	3	7	3.81	1134/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	606/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1301/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1256/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1359/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1133/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1225/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	954/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	1	4	5	3.50	931/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	612/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	855/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	526/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.85

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Ambuehl,Stacey

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	17

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	7	4	3.65	1312/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	6	4	3.59	1303/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	7	3	3.35	1196/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	2	0	4	3	0	2.89	1372/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	7	2	5	3.63	1113/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1248/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	2	3	7	3.81	1134/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	606/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	516/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	764/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1125/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	437/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	1004/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	1095/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	1	4	5	3.50	931/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	612/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	855/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	526/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.85

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 09
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Polasani,Shivan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	17

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 6 Required for Majors	14	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 4 General	1	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 2	0	Electives 0 Other 0

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	997/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	1061/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	805/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1094/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	5	1	9	4.06	796/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1148/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	1	4	10	3.95	1024/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	1057/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	4	7	3	3.56	1218/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	1082/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	1	0	4	8	4.21	1287/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1205/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	0	1	3	7	3.79	1170/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	2	1	0	3	6	3.83	864/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	3	2	7	3.67	882/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	1	4	1	7	3.67	979/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	2	5	1	5	3.33	1048/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	1	3	1	7	3.92	484/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.92

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	20

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

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	997/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	1061/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	805/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1094/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	5	1	9	4.06	796/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1148/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	1	4	10	3.95	1024/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	1057/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	971/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	866/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1192/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	805/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	0	6	4.00	1053/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	415/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	3	2	7	3.67	882/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	1	4	1	7	3.67	979/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	2	5	1	5	3.33	1048/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	1	3	1	7	3.92	484/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.92

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	20

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 6 Required for Majors	13 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 5 General	3	Under-grad 20 Non-major
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	997/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	1061/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	805/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1094/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	5	1	9	4.06	796/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1148/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	1	4	10	3.95	1024/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	1057/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1082/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	3	2	7	3.67	882/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	1	4	1	7	3.67	979/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	2	5	1	5	3.33	1048/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	1	3	1	7	3.92	484/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.92

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Neal,Jacob

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	20

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 6 Required for Majors	13 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 5 General	3	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 4	0 0 0 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	997/1449	3.59	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	1061/1446	3.60	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	805/1256	3.58	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1094/1402	3.33	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	5	1	9	4.06	796/1358	3.56	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1148/1327	3.13	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	1	4	10	3.95	1024/1435	3.84	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	1057/1446	4.52	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	803/1437	3.54	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1386	3.97	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1290/1390	4.18	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1058/1379	3.79	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1231/1379	3.65	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1236	3.60	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	3	2	7	3.67	882/1121	3.40	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	1	4	1	7	3.67	979/1122	4.06	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	2	5	1	5	3.33	1048/1121	3.50	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	1	3	1	7	3.92	484/790	3.52	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.92

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102 10
Title:	Prin Of Chemistry II
Instructor:	Roman, Kim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	72
Questionnaires:	20

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

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1106/1449	4.00	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	1	3	3.70	1257/1446	3.70	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	528/1402	4.50	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	3	1	2	1	0	2.14	1426/1435	2.14	3.91	4.20	4.11	2.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1233/1446	4.22	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1145/1437	3.71	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1177/1386	4.00	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1002/1390	4.67	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1220/1379	3.67	4.14	4.34	4.28	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1303/1379	3.33	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1236	****	3.87	4.08	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	44/67	4.50	4.50	4.58	4.48	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	49/66	4.20	4.60	4.36	4.35	4.20
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	43/64	4.00	4.33	4.25	4.01	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	63/75	3.67	4.08	4.32	3.95	3.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	68/73	2.40	3.58	4.00	3.44	2.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	10

Questions			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General			1	Under-grad	10	Non-major		9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives			0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			0					
				?	1									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	1187/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	10	4	3.76	1228/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	4	7	2	3.53	1158/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	8	5	3.84	1127/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	3	9	3.71	1065/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	6	6	4	3.71	1043/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	7	5	5	3.38	1301/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	263/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	5	8	2	3.59	1209/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	2	5	11	4.05	1164/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	3	2	15	4.43	1210/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	1	9	8	4.00	1058/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	0	3	6	7	3.60	1231/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	2	1	5	5	3	3.38	1063/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	0	1	0	1	2.00	1116/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1097/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	2.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1104/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	66/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	117/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.39
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	34/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	80/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.61
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	142/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.11
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	1187/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	10	4	3.76	1228/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	4	7	2	3.53	1158/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	8	5	3.84	1127/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	3	9	3.71	1065/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	6	6	4	3.71	1043/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	7	5	5	3.38	1301/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	263/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	573/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	803/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	872/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	702/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	8	7	4.11	1011/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	777/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	0	1	0	1	2.00	1116/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1097/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	2.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1104/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	66/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	117/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.39
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	34/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	80/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.61
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	142/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.11
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 1	B 11		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Magnanelli, Tim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	1187/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	10	4	3.76	1228/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	4	7	2	3.53	1158/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	5	8	5	3.84	1127/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	3	9	3.71	1065/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	6	6	4	3.71	1043/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	7	5	5	3.38	1301/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	263/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	470/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	755/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	1088/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	635/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	990/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	996/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	0	1	0	1	2.00	1116/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1097/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	2.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1104/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	66/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.56

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 02
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Magnanelli, Tim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	117/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.39
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	34/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	80/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.61
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	142/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.11
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	3	2	8	5	3.55	1343/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	3	7	7	3.90	1151/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	2	10	6	4.11	895/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	1	6	6	3	3.53	1266/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	2	11	4.17	717/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	3	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1089/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	2	5	1	6	3.17	1359/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	546/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	8	2	3.69	1162/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	6	10	4.15	1117/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	1162/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	6	4	8	3.95	1097/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	6	7	3.75	1182/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	2	7	3	2	2.94	1158/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1006/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1063/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	978/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	141/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	113/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	41/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	99/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.53
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	111/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	3	2	8	5	3.55	1343/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	3	7	7	3.90	1151/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	2	10	6	4.11	895/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	1	6	6	3	3.53	1266/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	2	11	4.17	717/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	3	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1089/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	2	5	1	6	3.17	1359/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	546/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	680/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	660/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	906/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	635/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	9	8	4.32	850/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	1	2	6	5	3.69	946/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1006/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1063/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	978/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	141/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	113/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	41/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	99/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.53
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	111/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Bogen,Will

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	3	2	8	5	3.55	1343/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	3	7	7	3.90	1151/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	2	10	6	4.11	895/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	1	6	6	3	3.53	1266/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	2	11	4.17	717/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	3	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1089/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	2	5	1	6	3.17	1359/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	546/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	5	8	0	3.62	1196/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1217/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	3	9	4	3.78	1357/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	4	8	3	3.75	1190/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	7	4	3	3.44	1280/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	3	1	4	2	1	2.73	1191/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	1006/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1063/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	978/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 03
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Bogen,Will

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	141/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	113/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	41/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	99/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.53
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	111/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	7	4.07	1071/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	6	7	4.20	918/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	936/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	791/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	336/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	944/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	8	1	5	3.67	1209/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	735/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	407/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	659/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	504/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	579/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	2	1	7	3.77	904/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	23/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	55/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	18/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	54/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	46/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	15

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 6 Required for Majors	10 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0 General	2	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	7	4.07	1071/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	6	7	4.20	918/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	936/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	791/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	336/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	944/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	8	1	5	3.67	1209/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	459/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	726/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1002/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	702/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	543/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	641/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	23/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	55/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	18/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	54/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	46/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	15

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 6 Required for Majors	10 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0 General	2	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Dorjsuren,B.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	7	4.07	1071/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	6	7	4.20	918/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	7	4	4.00	936/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	791/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	336/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	944/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	8	1	5	3.67	1209/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	659/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	1148/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	4	0	6	4.00	1331/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	3	0	2	5	3.90	1124/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	1053/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	709/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Dorjsuren,B.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	15

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	23/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	55/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	18/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	54/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	46/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.64
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 04
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Dorjsuren,B.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	15

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 6 Required for Majors	10 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0 General	2	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	7	11	4.08	1059/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	518/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	5	4	12	4.18	834/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	8	11	4.27	791/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	345/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	819/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	3	0	4	13	4.05	949/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	7	8	3	3.78	1103/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	5	17	4.54	764/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	872/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	8	13	4.33	832/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	1	17	4.33	836/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	1	3	2	10	3.94	777/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	283/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	691/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	731/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	45/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.68
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	34/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	16/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	16/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.77
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	7	11	4.08	1059/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	518/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	5	4	12	4.18	834/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	8	11	4.27	791/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	345/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	819/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	3	0	4	13	4.05	949/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	627/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	660/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	838/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	410/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	2	16	4.55	644/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	1	1	2	11	4.31	508/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	283/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	691/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	731/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	45/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.68
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	34/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	16/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	16/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.77
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 4 Required for Majors	20	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 2 General	1	Under-grad 24 Non-major 22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0 Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Magnanelli, Tim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	7	11	4.08	1059/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	518/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	5	4	12	4.18	834/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	8	11	4.27	791/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	345/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	819/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	3	0	4	13	4.05	949/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	209/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	516/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	710/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	211/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	430/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	264/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	283/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	691/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	731/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Magnanelli, Tim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	45/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.68
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	34/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	16/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	16/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.77
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 05
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Magnanelli, Tim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	8	7	3.90	1187/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	10	7	4.05	1039/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	6	7	5	3.84	1038/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	10	5	3.90	1094/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	8	4	3.50	1174/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	7	5	3.79	1002/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	8	5	3	3.14	1364/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	7	4	3	3.60	1201/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	1090/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	1	15	4.50	1162/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	12	6	4.20	946/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	6	5	5	3.45	1273/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	3	1	4	4	2	3.07	1138/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	91/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	159/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	145/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	92/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	0	2	5	7	3.94	155/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	3.94

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	8	7	3.90	1187/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	10	7	4.05	1039/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	6	7	5	3.84	1038/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	10	5	3.90	1094/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	8	4	3.50	1174/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	7	5	3.79	1002/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	8	5	3	3.14	1364/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	0	0	3	8	2	3.92	986/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	783/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	855/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	814/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	4	4	5	3.47	1265/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	3	1	2	4	3	3.23	1110/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	91/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	159/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	145/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	92/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	0	2	5	7	3.94	155/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	3.94

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ghourichae,S.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	8	7	3.90	1187/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	10	7	4.05	1039/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	6	7	5	3.84	1038/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	10	5	3.90	1094/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	8	4	3.50	1174/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	7	5	3.79	1002/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	8	5	3	3.14	1364/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	691/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	972/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	3	0	12	4.60	1070/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	814/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1193/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	864/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 06
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ghourichae,S.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	91/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	159/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	145/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.38
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	92/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	0	2	5	7	3.94	155/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	3.94

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	4	2	9	4	3.68	1296/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	10	5	3.95	1106/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	3	10	2	3.65	1131/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	1132/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	994/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	2	1	8	4	3.75	1017/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	3	5	7	3.74	1173/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	11	4	1	3.29	1324/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	4	11	4.25	1052/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	1162/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	8	7	3.95	1091/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	6	4	5	3.47	1265/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	3	2	3	1	2.82	1178/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	992/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	2	2	0	4	3.20	1055/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	0	3	1	2	2.89	1091/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.89
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	153/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	85/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	29/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.85
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	52/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.74
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	42/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.65
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	4	2	9	4	3.68	1296/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	10	5	3.95	1106/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	3	10	2	3.65	1131/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	1132/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	994/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	2	1	8	4	3.75	1017/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	3	5	7	3.74	1173/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	550/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	337/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	582/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	316/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	1053/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	709/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	992/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	2	2	0	4	3.20	1055/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	0	3	1	2	2.89	1091/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.89
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	153/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	85/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	29/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.85
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	52/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.74
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	42/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.65
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Woody,Caitlin

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	4	2	9	4	3.68	1296/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	10	5	3.95	1106/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	3	10	2	3.65	1131/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	1132/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	994/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	2	1	8	4	3.75	1017/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	3	5	7	3.74	1173/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	1	9	4	3.88	1035/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	946/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	1250/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	1010/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	3	3	8	3.88	1132/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	1113/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	992/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	2	2	0	4	3.20	1055/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	0	3	1	2	2.89	1091/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.89
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 07
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Woody,Caitlin

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	153/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	85/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	29/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.85
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	52/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.74
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	42/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.65
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	977/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	8	9	4.00	1061/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	3	2	9	4	3.78	1070/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	4	8	6	4.00	1022/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	827/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	847/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	8	6	3.74	1173/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	263/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	9	4	4.00	868/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	937/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	1014/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	3	7	10	4.00	1058/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	9	8	3.96	1089/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	823/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	4	1	1	2.88	1068/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1067/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	1078/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	1	0	6	11	4.15	135/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	51/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	58/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	38/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	85/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.45

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	977/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	8	9	4.00	1061/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	3	2	9	4	3.78	1070/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	4	8	6	4.00	1022/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	827/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	847/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	8	6	3.74	1173/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	263/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	638/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	614/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	1002/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	0	6	13	4.38	787/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	7	9	4.10	1015/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	607/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	4	1	1	2.88	1068/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1067/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	1078/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	1	0	6	11	4.15	135/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	51/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	58/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	38/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	85/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.45

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Magnanelli, Tim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	977/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	8	9	4.00	1061/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	3	2	9	4	3.78	1070/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	4	8	6	4.00	1022/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	4	4	8	4.00	827/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	847/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	8	6	3.74	1173/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	263/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	438/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	803/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	1116/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	1	5	10	4.11	1018/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	1032/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	12	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	4	1	1	2.88	1068/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	4	2	0	3.14	1067/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	4	2	0	3.00	1078/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 08
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Magnanelli, Tim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	1	0	6	11	4.15	135/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	51/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	58/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	38/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	85/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.45

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	947/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	808/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	895/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	947/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	8	9	4.26	618/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	721/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	5	4	7	3.70	1187/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	1145/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	6	11	4.30	1015/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	1070/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	928/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	10	3.95	1089/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	4	1	1	4	3	3.08	1138/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	899/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1055/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1060/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	141/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	113/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	141/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	68/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	122/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.27
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	1	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	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	947/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	808/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	895/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	947/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	8	9	4.26	618/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	721/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	5	4	7	3.70	1187/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	868/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	840/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	855/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	796/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	1004/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	811/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	899/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1055/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1060/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	141/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	113/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	141/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	68/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	122/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.27
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	1	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	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Westfall,Brad

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	947/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	808/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	895/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	947/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	8	9	4.26	618/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	1	5	8	4.19	721/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	5	4	7	3.70	1187/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	147/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	163/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	425/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	302/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	445/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	709/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	899/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1055/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1060/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Westfall,Brad

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	141/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	113/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	141/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	68/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	122/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.27
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 09
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Westfall,Brad

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	1	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	1				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	6	9	7	4.05	1082/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	12	7	4.18	935/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	10	5	3.73	1097/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	1	5	8	3	3.47	1283/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	2	3	8	5	3.89	954/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	2	6	6	4	3.67	1061/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	11	4	3.64	1225/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	1	19	4.76	776/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	6	10	2	3.60	1201/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	11	10	4.41	929/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	1036/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	8	11	4.17	967/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	9	9	4.19	949/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	1092/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	931/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1104/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	997/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	94/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.35
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	67/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.59
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	119/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	151/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	54/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	20 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 9		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2 C 0	General	0 Under-grad 23 Non-major 22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	6	9	7	4.05	1082/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	12	7	4.18	935/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	10	5	3.73	1097/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	1	5	8	3	3.47	1283/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	2	3	8	5	3.89	954/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	2	6	6	4	3.67	1061/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	11	4	3.64	1225/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	1	19	4.76	776/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	616/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	583/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	633/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	518/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	717/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	2	2	4	10	4.05	692/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	931/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1104/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	997/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	94/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.35
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	67/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.59
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	119/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	151/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	54/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	20 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 9		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2 C 0	General	0 Under-grad 23 Non-major 22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10 F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Woody,Caitlin

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	6	9	7	4.05	1082/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	12	7	4.18	935/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	10	5	3.73	1097/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	2	1	5	8	3	3.47	1283/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	2	3	8	5	3.89	954/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	2	6	6	4	3.67	1061/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	11	4	3.64	1225/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	1	19	4.76	776/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	724/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	735/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	8	12	4.41	1223/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	743/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	836/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	415/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	931/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	0	1	2	1	2.71	1104/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	997/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Woody,Caitlin

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	94/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.35
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	67/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.59
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	119/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	151/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	54/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 10
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Woody,Caitlin

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	9	4	3.64	1316/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	10	4	3.73	1247/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	5	5	6	3.74	1091/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	11	5	3.90	1094/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	658/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	898/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	6	7	3.68	1198/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	2	8	7	2	3.35	1305/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	5	4	10	3.95	1206/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	1162/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	5	10	4	3.59	1240/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	3	3	5	5	3.00	1334/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	3	8	1	2	2.88	1171/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	662/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	537/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	809/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	83/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	69/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	97/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	89/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.58
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	88/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.44
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	9	4	3.64	1316/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	10	4	3.73	1247/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	5	5	6	3.74	1091/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	11	5	3.90	1094/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	658/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	898/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	6	7	3.68	1198/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	1	12	4	4.06	835/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	963/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	821/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	805/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	7	7	3.89	1128/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	666/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	662/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	537/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	809/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	83/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	69/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	97/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	89/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.58
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	88/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.44
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Magnanelli, Tim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	7	9	4	3.64	1316/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	10	4	3.73	1247/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	5	5	6	3.74	1091/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	11	5	3.90	1094/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	658/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	898/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	6	7	3.68	1198/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	427/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	516/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	1198/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	635/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	900/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	1	1	3	0	5	3.70	938/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	662/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	537/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	809/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 11
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Magnanelli, Tim

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	83/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	69/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	97/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	89/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.58
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	88/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.44
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 12
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	7	9	3.96	1146/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	953/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	11	8	4.23	805/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	9	9	4.14	927/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	628/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	2	4	4	5	3.47	1139/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	7	7	3	5	3.17	1357/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	263/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	13	1	3.79	1096/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	11	12	4.46	866/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	1002/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	756/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	7	11	4.17	970/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	1	5	3	5	3.67	954/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	****/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 12
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	6	8	8	3.96	162/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	3.96
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	134/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	2	3	5	13	4.26	160/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.26
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	83/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.61
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	1	3	8	9	3.91	159/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	3.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Major 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Non-major 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	7	9	3.96	1146/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	953/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	11	8	4.23	805/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	9	9	4.14	927/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	628/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	2	4	4	5	3.47	1139/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	7	7	3	5	3.17	1357/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	263/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	13	4	4.11	803/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	568/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	478/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	451/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	858/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	777/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	****/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	6	8	8	3.96	162/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	3.96
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	134/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	2	3	5	13	4.26	160/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.26
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	83/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.61
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	1	3	8	9	3.91	159/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	3.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		Major 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Non-major 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 12
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ghourichae,S.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	7	9	3.96	1146/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	953/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	11	8	4.23	805/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	9	9	4.14	927/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	628/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	2	4	4	5	3.47	1139/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	7	7	3	5	3.17	1357/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	263/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	8	7	4.16	747/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	691/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	1162/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	611/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	807/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	709/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	****/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 12
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Ghourichae,S.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	6	8	8	3.96	162/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	3.96
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	134/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	2	3	5	13	4.26	160/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.26
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	83/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.61
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	2	1	3	8	9	3.91	159/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	3.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 2	Under-grad 24 Non-major 22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 13
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	2	8	10	3.96	1146/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	10	4.25	863/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	819/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	7	10	4.04	996/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	8	12	4.25	628/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	9	7	5	3.54	1111/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	3	9	6	3.50	1262/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	263/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	822/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	12	10	4.29	1022/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	1088/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	11	11	4.33	832/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	10	11	4.25	900/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	3	1	6	6	3	3.26	1101/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	547/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	691/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	809/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 13
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	4	8	10	4.13	141/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	32/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.74
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	3	4	16	4.57	112/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	92/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	4	1	17	4.48	78/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.48

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	2	8	10	3.96	1146/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	10	4.25	863/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	819/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	7	10	4.04	996/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	8	12	4.25	628/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	9	7	5	3.54	1111/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	3	9	6	3.50	1262/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	263/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	406/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	553/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	531/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	248/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	579/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	1	2	5	7	3.82	870/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	547/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	691/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	809/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	4	8	10	4.13	141/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	32/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.74
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	3	4	16	4.57	112/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	92/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	4	1	17	4.48	78/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.48

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 13
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Rapp,Matthew

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	2	8	10	3.96	1146/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	10	4.25	863/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	819/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	7	10	4.04	996/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	8	12	4.25	628/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	9	7	5	3.54	1111/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	3	9	6	3.50	1262/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	263/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	4	7	3	3.93	986/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	1052/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	1314/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	635/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	786/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	709/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	547/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	691/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	809/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 13
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Rapp,Matthew

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	4	8	10	4.13	141/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	32/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.74
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	3	4	16	4.57	112/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	92/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	4	1	17	4.48	78/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.48

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Major 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Non-major 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 14
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	6	3	3.59	1334/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	1228/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	3	2	7	3.87	1031/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	4	2	5	3.64	1219/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	905/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	6	2	3	3	2.94	1280/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	4	3	2	5	3.25	1340/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	368/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	5	8	3	3.88	1035/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	2	11	4.31	1006/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	3	12	4.56	1106/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	1	4	9	4.00	1058/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	2	5	6	3.87	1140/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	967/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	3	2	1	2	2.80	1075/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	2	1	1	3	2.90	1090/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	2.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	1	3	0	2	2.50	1111/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	768/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	2.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 14
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	3	3	2	4	3.21	192/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	3.21
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	3	4	0	6	3.69	176/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	3.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	156/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	175/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	3.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	116/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 3	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1 C 2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2 D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 1						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	6	3	3.59	1334/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	1228/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	3	2	7	3.87	1031/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	4	2	5	3.64	1219/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	905/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	6	2	3	3	2.94	1280/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	4	3	2	5	3.25	1340/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	368/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	4	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	585/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	803/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	582/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	316/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	1	7	4	3.86	1144/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	954/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	3	2	1	2	2.80	1075/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	2	1	1	3	2.90	1090/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	2.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	1	3	0	2	2.50	1111/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	768/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	2.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	3	3	2	4	3.21	192/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	3.21
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	3	4	0	6	3.69	176/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	3.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	156/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	175/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	3.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	116/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 14
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Dakermanji,TJ

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	6	3	3.59	1334/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	1228/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	3	2	7	3.87	1031/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	4	2	5	3.64	1219/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	905/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	6	2	3	3	2.94	1280/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	4	3	2	5	3.25	1340/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	368/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	2	4	5	4	3.56	1218/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	4	1	8	3.93	1217/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	1311/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	3	2	8	3.88	1138/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	1	4	5	3.47	1269/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1012/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	3	2	1	2	2.80	1075/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	2	1	1	3	2.90	1090/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	2.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	4	1	3	0	2	2.50	1111/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	768/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	2.80

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 14
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Dakermanji,TJ

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	3	3	2	4	3.21	192/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	3.21
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	3	4	0	6	3.69	176/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	3.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	156/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	175/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	3.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	116/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.31

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 15
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	8	4	6	3.79	1247/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	907/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	2	6	7	3.89	1023/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	4	6	6	3.78	1162/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	954/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	1	4	5	2	3.00	1264/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	2	2	6	4	3.22	1346/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	316/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	822/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	989/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	1058/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	716/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	836/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	3	2	1	5	2	3.08	1138/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	980/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	1	1	0	3	2.88	1093/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	2.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	1	2	0	3	3.13	1073/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 15
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	165/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	3.94
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	149/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.19
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	58/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	116/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.47
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	65/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.53

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	8	4	6	3.79	1247/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	907/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	2	6	7	3.89	1023/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	4	6	6	3.78	1162/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	954/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	1	4	5	2	3.00	1264/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	2	2	6	4	3.22	1346/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	316/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	758/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	783/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	855/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	464/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	997/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	3	1	3	5	3.62	975/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	980/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	1	1	0	3	2.88	1093/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	2.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	1	2	0	3	3.13	1073/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	165/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	3.94
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	149/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.19
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	58/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	116/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.47
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	65/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.53

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 15
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Max,Ryan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	8	4	6	3.79	1247/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	907/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	2	6	7	3.89	1023/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	4	6	6	3.78	1162/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	954/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	1	4	5	2	3.00	1264/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	4	2	2	6	4	3.22	1346/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	316/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	304/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	3	11	4.22	1075/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	958/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	675/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	1004/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	1	2	0	4	3	3.60	980/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	980/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	1	1	0	3	2.88	1093/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	2.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	1	2	0	3	3.13	1073/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 15
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Max,Ryan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	24
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	165/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	3.94
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	149/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.19
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	58/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	116/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.47
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	65/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.53

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	3	4	3	7	3.29	1397/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	5	7	3.62	1293/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	0	4	5	6	3.61	1143/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	4	3	5	5	3.37	1313/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	3	5	8	3.89	946/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	0	4	4	7	3.67	1061/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	1	5	2	8	3.33	1318/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	809/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	7	12	4.38	946/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	0	3	16	4.52	1143/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	0	7	12	4.33	832/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	4	4	9	3.85	1144/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	870/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	0	0	5	3.33	992/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	2	0	5	3.67	979/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	4	0	0	2	3	3.00	1078/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	108/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.28
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	101/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	2	1	0	4	11	4.17	173/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.17
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	1	4	11	4.33	145/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	144/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	3	4	3	7	3.29	1397/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	5	7	3.62	1293/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	0	4	5	6	3.61	1143/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	4	3	5	5	3.37	1313/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	3	5	8	3.89	946/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	0	4	4	7	3.67	1061/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	1	5	2	8	3.33	1318/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	669/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	1106/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	1088/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	867/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	5	2	7	3.71	1201/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	800/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	0	0	5	3.33	992/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	2	0	5	3.67	979/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	4	0	0	2	3	3.00	1078/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	108/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.28
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	101/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	2	1	0	4	11	4.17	173/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.17
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	1	4	11	4.33	145/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	144/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Topper,Michael

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	3	4	3	7	3.29	1397/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	5	7	3.62	1293/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	0	4	5	6	3.61	1143/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	4	3	5	5	3.37	1313/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	3	5	8	3.89	946/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	0	4	4	7	3.67	1061/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	1	5	2	8	3.33	1318/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	868/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	1	0	1	10	4.38	946/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	980/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	635/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	0	2	0	10	3.93	1103/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	1	2	1	1	6	3.82	876/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	1	0	0	5	3.33	992/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	2	0	5	3.67	979/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	4	0	0	2	3	3.00	1078/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Topper,Michael

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	108/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.28
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	101/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	2	1	0	4	11	4.17	173/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.17
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	1	4	11	4.33	145/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	2	2	4	9	4.00	144/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 16
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Topper,Michael

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	23
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 18
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	5	9	4.11	1048/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	907/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	841/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	570/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	6	3	6	3.71	1071/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	950/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	944/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	316/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	724/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	903/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	821/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	893/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	892/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	1	5	2	6	3.73	921/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	854/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	827/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	855/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	731/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 18
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	150/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.09
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	34/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	132/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	35/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	54/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	5	9	4.11	1048/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	907/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	841/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	570/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	6	3	6	3.71	1071/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	950/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	944/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	316/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	868/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	1052/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	872/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	919/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	2	9	4.19	956/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	685/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	854/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	827/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	855/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	731/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	150/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.09
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	34/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	132/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	35/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	54/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 18
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sullivan,Kelsey

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	5	9	4.11	1048/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	907/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	841/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	570/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	6	3	6	3.71	1071/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	950/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	944/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	316/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	9	3	4.00	868/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	916/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	1186/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	919/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	883/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	709/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	854/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	827/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	855/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	731/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 18
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sullivan,Kelsey

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	150/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.09
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	34/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	132/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	35/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	54/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 19
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	783/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1011/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	1176/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1290/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	954/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1152/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	1060/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	848/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1270/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	1235/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	1295/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	1229/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	0	1	6	3.73	1193/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	2	2	0	1	2.25	1222/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	899/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	857/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	855/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 19
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	64/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	69/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	111/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	27/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	58/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 19
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	783/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1011/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	1176/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1290/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	954/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1152/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	1060/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	848/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	140/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	204/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	761/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	356/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	295/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	666/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	899/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	857/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	855/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 19
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	64/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	69/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	111/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	27/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	58/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 19
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Buck,Ryan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	783/1449	3.90	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1011/1446	4.05	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	1176/1256	3.89	3.95	4.34	4.21	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1290/1402	3.89	3.85	4.27	4.10	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	954/1358	4.03	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1152/1327	3.68	3.75	4.16	3.92	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	1	4	3.90	1060/1435	3.55	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	848/1446	4.94	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	226/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	803/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1070/1390	4.60	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	384/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	197/1379	4.09	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	112/1236	3.70	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	899/1121	3.47	3.61	4.18	3.89	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	857/1122	3.50	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	855/1121	3.45	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/790	2.90	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 102L 19
Title:	Intro Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Buck,Ryan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	12
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	64/200	4.22	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.57
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	69/205	4.45	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	111/201	4.60	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	27/202	4.59	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	58/196	4.39	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 124 1
Title:	Gen Organic & Biochem II
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	57
Questionnaires:	44

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	34	4.70	320/1449	4.70	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	39	4.84	149/1446	4.84	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	9	30	4.64	389/1256	4.64	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	3	24	4.76	236/1402	4.76	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	18	2	2	6	2	14	3.92	916/1358	3.92	3.89	4.13	4.04	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	26	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	101/1327	4.88	3.75	4.16	3.92	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	39	4.86	115/1435	4.86	3.91	4.20	4.11	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	34	10	4.23	1233/1446	4.23	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	11	27	4.71	184/1437	4.71	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	39	4.93	163/1386	4.93	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	42	4.98	160/1390	4.98	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	38	4.90	127/1379	4.90	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	40	4.95	85/1379	4.95	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	25	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	256/1236	4.61	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/1121	****	3.61	4.18	3.89	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/1122	****	3.88	4.36	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1121	****	3.67	4.40	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	37	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 124 1
Title:	Gen Organic & Biochem II
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	57
Questionnaires:	44

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L O2
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Tyminski, Frank

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	821/1449	4.47	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	425/1446	4.54	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	717/1256	4.36	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	947/1402	4.31	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	568/1358	4.42	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	404/1327	4.36	3.75	4.16	3.92	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	7	6	3.94	1024/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1446	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	438/1437	4.29	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	443/1386	4.70	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1390	4.84	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	464/1379	4.75	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	666/1379	4.64	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	362/1236	4.16	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	165/1121	4.68	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	537/1122	4.25	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	439/1121	4.30	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	158/790	4.05	3.65	4.06	3.89	4.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	72/200	4.53	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	58/205	4.65	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	38/201	4.77	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.81
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	92/202	4.70	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	49/196	4.64	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	18

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 5 Required for Majors	16	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0 General	0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L O2
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Koch,Dan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	821/1449	4.47	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	425/1446	4.54	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	717/1256	4.36	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	947/1402	4.31	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	568/1358	4.42	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	404/1327	4.36	3.75	4.16	3.92	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	7	6	3.94	1024/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.11	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1446	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.57	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	627/1437	4.29	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	534/1386	4.70	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1097/1390	4.84	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	187/1379	4.75	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	611/1379	4.64	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	331/1236	4.16	3.87	4.08	3.93	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	165/1121	4.68	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	537/1122	4.25	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	439/1121	4.30	3.67	4.40	4.08	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	158/790	4.05	3.65	4.06	3.89	4.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 02
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Koch, Dan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	18

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	72/200	4.53	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	58/205	4.65	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	38/201	4.77	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.81
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	92/202	4.70	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	49/196	4.64	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 02
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Koch,Dan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	18

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 5 Required for Majors	16	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0 General	0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0 Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	460/1449	4.47	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	610/1446	4.54	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	14	4.39	654/1256	4.36	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	528/1402	4.31	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	353/1358	4.42	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	3	3	11	4.21	695/1327	4.36	3.75	4.16	3.92	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	788/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.11	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	888/1446	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	0	9	8	4.21	680/1437	4.29	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	516/1386	4.70	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	531/1390	4.84	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	302/1379	4.75	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	18	4.71	445/1379	4.64	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	2	1	5	10	4.11	675/1236	4.16	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	365/1121	4.68	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	857/1122	4.25	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	920/1121	4.30	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	643/790	4.05	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	0	1	15	4.56	66/200	4.53	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	48/205	4.65	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	69/201	4.77	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.72
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	31/202	4.70	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	44/196	4.64	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.65
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5 C 2	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 03
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Francisco,Sofia

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	460/1449	4.47	4.01	4.33	4.14	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	610/1446	4.54	4.03	4.29	4.20	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	14	4.39	654/1256	4.36	3.95	4.34	4.21	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	528/1402	4.31	3.85	4.27	4.10	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	353/1358	4.42	3.89	4.13	4.04	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	3	3	11	4.21	695/1327	4.36	3.75	4.16	3.92	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	788/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.11	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	888/1446	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.57	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	659/1437	4.29	3.90	4.12	4.04	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	707/1386	4.70	4.33	4.48	4.40	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	633/1390	4.84	4.50	4.74	4.67	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	316/1379	4.75	4.14	4.34	4.28	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	385/1379	4.64	4.08	4.36	4.26	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	6	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	996/1236	4.16	3.87	4.08	3.93	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	365/1121	4.68	3.61	4.18	3.89	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	857/1122	4.25	3.88	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	920/1121	4.30	3.67	4.40	4.08	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	643/790	4.05	3.65	4.06	3.89	3.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 03
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Francisco,Sofia

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	0	1	15	4.56	66/200	4.53	4.37	4.28	4.19	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	48/205	4.65	4.48	4.29	4.37	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	69/201	4.77	4.64	4.51	4.57	4.72
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	31/202	4.70	4.54	4.42	4.55	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	44/196	4.64	4.37	4.25	4.42	4.65
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 124L 03
Title:	Gen Organic Biochem Lab
Instructor:	Francisco,Sofia

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	23

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1 A 10	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0 B 8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5 C 2	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4 D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7 F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 3
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	LaCourse,Willia

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	886/1449	4.08	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	997/1446	3.94	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	984/1256	3.81	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	1	4	3	7	3.71	1194/1402	3.64	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	717/1358	3.69	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	765/1327	3.78	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	687/1435	4.22	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	586/1446	4.79	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1042/1437	3.93	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	946/1386	4.18	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	1058/1390	4.36	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	6	4	7	3.94	1097/1379	3.99	4.14	4.34	4.38	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	5	4	6	3.72	1193/1379	3.74	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	3	1	2	8	3.87	846/1236	3.78	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1121	2.70	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1122	3.22	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1121	3.56	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 3
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	LaCourse,Willia

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	37/200	4.51	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	137/205	4.39	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	69/201	4.86	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	140/202	4.43	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	134/196	4.31	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.18

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	2				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 3
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	886/1449	4.08	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	997/1446	3.94	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	984/1256	3.81	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	1	4	3	7	3.71	1194/1402	3.64	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	717/1358	3.69	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	765/1327	3.78	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	687/1435	4.22	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	586/1446	4.79	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	1	1	3	8	3.93	971/1437	3.93	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1052/1386	4.18	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1223/1390	4.36	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	576/1379	3.99	4.14	4.34	4.38	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	836/1379	3.74	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	709/1236	3.78	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1121	2.70	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1122	3.22	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1121	3.56	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 3
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	37/200	4.51	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	137/205	4.39	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	69/201	4.86	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	140/202	4.43	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	134/196	4.31	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.18

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	2				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 3
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	886/1449	4.08	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	997/1446	3.94	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	984/1256	3.81	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	1	4	3	7	3.71	1194/1402	3.64	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	717/1358	3.69	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	765/1327	3.78	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	687/1435	4.22	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	586/1446	4.79	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	550/1437	3.93	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1285/1386	4.18	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1345/1390	4.36	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1288/1379	3.99	4.14	4.34	4.38	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1053/1379	3.74	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	864/1236	3.78	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1121	2.70	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1122	3.22	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1121	3.56	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 3
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	37/200	4.51	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	137/205	4.39	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	69/201	4.86	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	140/202	4.43	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	134/196	4.31	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.18

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	2				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 3
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Bediako,Bernice

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	886/1449	4.08	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	997/1446	3.94	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	984/1256	3.81	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	1	4	3	7	3.71	1194/1402	3.64	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	717/1358	3.69	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	765/1327	3.78	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	687/1435	4.22	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	586/1446	4.79	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	1	1	4	7	3.87	1042/1437	3.93	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1285/1386	4.18	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1314/1390	4.36	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1288/1379	3.99	4.14	4.34	4.38	3.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1053/1379	3.74	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	1095/1236	3.78	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1121	2.70	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1122	3.22	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1121	3.56	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 3
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Bediako,Bernice

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	33
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	37/200	4.51	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	137/205	4.39	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	69/201	4.86	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	140/202	4.43	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	134/196	4.31	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.18

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	2				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 4
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	LaCourse,Willia

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	3	3	5	7	3.89	1197/1449	4.08	4.01	4.33	4.38	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	3	4	4	6	3.76	1228/1446	3.94	4.03	4.29	4.33	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1123/1256	3.81	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	1	2	4	2	5	3.57	1247/1402	3.64	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	5	5	3	3.22	1266/1358	3.69	3.89	4.13	4.14	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1165/1327	3.78	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	908/1435	4.22	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	848/1446	4.79	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	6	6	3	3.80	1082/1437	3.93	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	878/1386	4.18	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	1058/1390	4.36	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	0	7	8	4.18	967/1379	3.99	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	5	8	3.94	1096/1379	3.74	4.08	4.36	4.40	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	800/1236	3.78	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	1	2	0	3	2.70	1083/1121	2.70	3.61	4.18	4.31	2.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	0	2	0	4	3.22	1051/1122	3.22	3.88	4.36	4.46	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1002/1121	3.56	3.67	4.40	4.53	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 4
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	LaCourse,Willia

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	106/200	4.51	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	85/205	4.39	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/201	4.86	4.64	4.51	4.59	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	106/202	4.43	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	2	0	0	0	12	4.43	95/196	4.31	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	4.66	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	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	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 4
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	3	3	5	7	3.89	1197/1449	4.08	4.01	4.33	4.38	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	3	4	4	6	3.76	1228/1446	3.94	4.03	4.29	4.33	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1123/1256	3.81	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	1	2	4	2	5	3.57	1247/1402	3.64	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	5	5	3	3.22	1266/1358	3.69	3.89	4.13	4.14	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1165/1327	3.78	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	908/1435	4.22	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	848/1446	4.79	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	1042/1437	3.93	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	989/1386	4.18	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1230/1390	4.36	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1124/1379	3.99	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	1	2	1	4	3	3.55	1244/1379	3.74	4.08	4.36	4.40	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	7	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/1236	3.78	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	1	2	0	3	2.70	1083/1121	2.70	3.61	4.18	4.31	2.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	0	2	0	4	3.22	1051/1122	3.22	3.88	4.36	4.46	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1002/1121	3.56	3.67	4.40	4.53	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 4
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Carpenter, Tara

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	106/200	4.51	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	85/205	4.39	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/201	4.86	4.64	4.51	4.59	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	106/202	4.43	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	2	0	0	0	12	4.43	95/196	4.31	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	4.66	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	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	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 4
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	3	3	5	7	3.89	1197/1449	4.08	4.01	4.33	4.38	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	3	4	4	6	3.76	1228/1446	3.94	4.03	4.29	4.33	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1123/1256	3.81	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	1	2	4	2	5	3.57	1247/1402	3.64	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	5	5	3	3.22	1266/1358	3.69	3.89	4.13	4.14	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1165/1327	3.78	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	908/1435	4.22	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	848/1446	4.79	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	4	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	1209/1437	3.93	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1015/1386	4.18	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1192/1390	4.36	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	928/1379	3.99	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	2	1	4	2	3.18	1324/1379	3.74	4.08	4.36	4.40	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	7	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1236	3.78	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	1	2	0	3	2.70	1083/1121	2.70	3.61	4.18	4.31	2.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	0	2	0	4	3.22	1051/1122	3.22	3.88	4.36	4.46	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1002/1121	3.56	3.67	4.40	4.53	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 4
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	106/200	4.51	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	85/205	4.39	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/201	4.86	4.64	4.51	4.59	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	106/202	4.43	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	2	0	0	0	12	4.43	95/196	4.31	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	4.66	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	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	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 4
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Bediako,Bernice

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	3	3	5	7	3.89	1197/1449	4.08	4.01	4.33	4.38	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	3	4	4	6	3.76	1228/1446	3.94	4.03	4.29	4.33	3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1123/1256	3.81	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	4	1	2	4	2	5	3.57	1247/1402	3.64	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	5	5	3	3.22	1266/1358	3.69	3.89	4.13	4.14	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1165/1327	3.78	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	908/1435	4.22	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	848/1446	4.79	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	4	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	735/1437	3.93	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1015/1386	4.18	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1192/1390	4.36	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	928/1379	3.99	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	2	1	4	2	3.18	1324/1379	3.74	4.08	4.36	4.40	3.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	7	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1236	3.78	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	1	2	0	3	2.70	1083/1121	2.70	3.61	4.18	4.31	2.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	0	2	0	4	3.22	1051/1122	3.22	3.88	4.36	4.46	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1002/1121	3.56	3.67	4.40	4.53	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 300 4
Title:	Analytical Chemistry
Instructor:	Bediako,Bernice

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	106/200	4.51	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	85/205	4.39	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/201	4.86	4.64	4.51	4.59	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	106/202	4.43	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	2	0	0	0	12	4.43	95/196	4.31	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	4.66	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	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	13	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 302 1
Title:	Physical Chemistry II
Instructor:	Thorpe,Ian F

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	39

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	11	12	6	4	2.82	1426/1449	2.82	4.01	4.33	4.38	2.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	9	14	10	5	0	2.29	1441/1446	2.29	4.03	4.29	4.33	2.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	10	12	9	1	2.76	1249/1256	2.76	3.95	4.34	4.39	2.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	19	0	3	9	4	2	3.28	1328/1402	3.28	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	3	9	10	10	3.60	1124/1358	3.60	3.89	4.13	4.14	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	6	2	9	3	3.45	1148/1327	3.45	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	4	10	11	9	3.51	1260/1435	3.51	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	28	8	4.19	1261/1446	4.19	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	7	12	14	1	0	2.26	1431/1437	2.26	3.90	4.12	4.14	2.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	3	15	13	3	3.21	1355/1386	3.21	4.33	4.48	4.53	3.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	4	7	10	13	4	3.16	1384/1390	3.16	4.50	4.74	4.76	3.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	10	14	13	1	0	2.13	1377/1379	2.13	4.14	4.34	4.38	2.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	16	12	6	3	1	1.97	1378/1379	1.97	4.08	4.36	4.40	1.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	10	7	6	3	3	2.38	1216/1236	2.38	3.87	4.08	4.18	2.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1121	****	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/1122	****	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1121	****	3.67	4.40	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 302 1
Title:	Physical Chemistry II
Instructor:	Thorpe,Ian F

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	54
Questionnaires:	39

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 13	General	1	Under-grad	39	Non-major	24
84-150	19	3.00-3.49 12	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 8						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 303 1
Title:	Phys Chem For Biochem
Instructor:	Geddes,Christop

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	76
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	5	11	11	3.76	1262/1449	3.76	4.01	4.33	4.38	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	15	12	4.03	1044/1446	4.03	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	7	20	4.39	654/1256	4.39	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	31	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1402	****	3.85	4.27	4.37	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	6	5	9	5	1	2.62	1341/1358	2.62	3.89	4.13	4.14	2.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	30	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1327	****	3.75	4.16	4.23	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	25	4.55	440/1435	4.55	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	10	22	0	3.69	1423/1446	3.69	4.72	4.67	4.68	3.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	11	7	9	3.82	1068/1437	3.82	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	11	20	4.52	793/1386	4.52	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	372/1390	4.94	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	7	12	11	3.91	1124/1379	3.91	4.14	4.34	4.38	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	2	6	20	4.28	875/1379	4.28	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	2	2	0	9	14	4.15	641/1236	4.15	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1121	****	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1122	****	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1121	****	3.67	4.40	4.53	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 303 1
Title:	Phys Chem For Biochem
Instructor:	Geddes,Christop

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	76
Questionnaires:	33

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors	29
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	16	3.00-3.49 8	D 0	Under-grad	33
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	1
			? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 2
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	309/1449	4.61	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	479/1446	4.54	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	3.95	4.34	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	281/1402	4.61	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	827/1358	4.00	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	117/1327	4.93	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	257/1435	4.86	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	970/1446	4.29	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	364/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	534/1386	4.80	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1390	4.88	4.50	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	370/1379	4.18	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	445/1379	4.68	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1236	4.93	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/200	4.75	4.37	4.28	4.44	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	152/205	4.33	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	123/201	4.50	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	68/202	4.58	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	111/196	4.42	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 2	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 11
Title: Advanced Lab II		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Mang, Stephen A.		

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 2
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Manning,Steven

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	309/1449	4.61	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	479/1446	4.54	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	3.95	4.34	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	281/1402	4.61	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	827/1358	4.00	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	117/1327	4.93	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	257/1435	4.86	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	970/1446	4.29	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	364/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/200	4.75	4.37	4.28	4.44	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	152/205	4.33	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	123/201	4.50	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	68/202	4.58	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	111/196	4.42	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 312L 2	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 11
Title: Advanced Lab II		Questionnaires: 7
Instructor: Manning, Steven		

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

Laboratory														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	1									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 2
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Oleske,Jeffrey

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	309/1449	4.61	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	479/1446	4.54	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	3.95	4.34	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	281/1402	4.61	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	827/1358	4.00	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	117/1327	4.93	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	257/1435	4.86	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	970/1446	4.29	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	364/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/200	4.75	4.37	4.28	4.44	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	152/205	4.33	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	123/201	4.50	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	68/202	4.58	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	111/196	4.42	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 2
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Oleske,Jeffrey

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	7

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

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives			0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			0					
				?	1									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 3
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	594/1449	4.61	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	571/1446	4.54	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	528/1402	4.61	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	827/1358	4.00	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1327	4.93	3.75	4.16	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1435	4.86	3.91	4.20	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1354/1446	4.29	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	868/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	803/1386	4.80	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1162/1390	4.88	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1058/1379	4.18	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1053/1379	4.68	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	4.93	3.87	4.08	4.18	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	72/200	4.75	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	85/205	4.33	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	123/201	4.50	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	106/202	4.58	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	68/196	4.42	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 3
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen A.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	2

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 3
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Manning,Steven

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	594/1449	4.61	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	571/1446	4.54	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	528/1402	4.61	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	827/1358	4.00	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1327	4.93	3.75	4.16	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1435	4.86	3.91	4.20	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1354/1446	4.29	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1245/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.80	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1390	4.88	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1058/1379	4.18	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1379	4.68	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	72/200	4.75	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	85/205	4.33	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	123/201	4.50	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	106/202	4.58	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	68/196	4.42	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 3
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Manning,Steven

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	2

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 3
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Oleske,Jeffrey

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	2

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	594/1449	4.61	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	571/1446	4.54	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	528/1402	4.61	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	827/1358	4.00	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1327	4.93	3.75	4.16	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1435	4.86	3.91	4.20	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1354/1446	4.29	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1245/1437	4.08	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.80	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1390	4.88	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1058/1379	4.18	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1379	4.68	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	72/200	4.75	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	85/205	4.33	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	123/201	4.50	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	106/202	4.58	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	68/196	4.42	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 312L 3
Title:	Advanced Lab II
Instructor:	Oleske,Jeffrey

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	2

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 1
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	177
Questionnaires:	86

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	6	10	21	47	4.26	903/1449	4.26	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	10	32	38	4.19	935/1446	4.19	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	7	15	25	36	4.01	931/1256	4.01	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.01
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	62	3	2	4	6	8	3.61	1236/1402	3.61	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	1	2	10	19	45	4.36	521/1358	4.36	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	62	1	3	3	6	8	3.81	****/1327	****	3.75	4.16	4.23	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	3	7	30	39	4.21	818/1435	4.21	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	53	30	4.35	1143/1446	4.35	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	2	0	8	35	28	4.19	702/1437	4.19	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	21	60	4.68	599/1386	4.68	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	77	4.92	478/1390	4.92	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	8	28	42	4.23	928/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	11	21	47	4.26	892/1379	4.26	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	47	6	5	9	5	9	3.18	1124/1236	3.18	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	72	0	2	2	3	4	3	3.29	****/1121	****	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	72	0	2	3	2	2	5	3.36	****/1122	****	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	71	0	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	****/1121	****	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	71	13	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 1
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	177
Questionnaires:	86

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	81	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/200	****	4.37	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	81	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/205	****	4.48	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	81	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/201	****	4.64	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	81	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/202	****	4.54	4.42	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	81	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/196	****	4.37	4.25	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	83	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	83	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	83	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	83	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	4.80	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	84	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	85	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	4.66	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	85	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	83	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	83	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/18	****	****	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	84	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	84	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/15	****	****	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	84	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351 1
Title:	Organic Chemistry I
Instructor:	Smith,Paul J

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	177
Questionnaires:	86

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	74	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	17	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	23	2.00-2.99	15	C	23	General	0	Under-grad	85	Non-major	84
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	14	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	15	F	2	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	12						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	418/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	397/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	519/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	373/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	184/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	253/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	155/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	868/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	660/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	531/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	946/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	644/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	394/1236	4.32	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	727/1121	4.25	3.61	4.18	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	958/1122	4.17	3.88	4.36	4.46	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	855/1121	4.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	97/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	101/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	88/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	145/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	128/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.22

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L O2
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Odebode,Tijesun

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	418/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	397/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	519/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	373/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	184/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	253/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	155/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	791/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1052/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1047/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	796/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	900/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1012/1236	4.32	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	727/1121	4.25	3.61	4.18	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	958/1122	4.17	3.88	4.36	4.46	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	855/1121	4.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	97/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	101/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	88/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	145/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	128/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.22

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	783/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	841/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	879/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1171/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	939/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	783/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	749/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	669/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	660/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	923/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	885/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	430/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	436/1236	4.32	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	606/1121	4.25	3.61	4.18	4.31	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	322/1122	4.17	3.88	4.36	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	855/1121	4.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	67/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	55/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	18/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	75/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	2	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	111/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sesmero,Ester

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	783/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	841/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	879/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1171/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	939/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	783/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	749/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1029/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1177/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1047/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1190/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	807/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	4.32	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	606/1121	4.25	3.61	4.18	4.31	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	322/1122	4.17	3.88	4.36	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	855/1121	4.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sesmero,Ester

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	67/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	55/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	18/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	75/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	2	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	111/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1027/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	735/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	763/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	641/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	371/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	209/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1165/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	735/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	954/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	872/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1003/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	997/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	331/1236	4.32	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	396/1121	4.25	3.61	4.18	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	857/1122	4.17	3.88	4.36	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	855/1121	4.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	138/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	36/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	111/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	127/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	139/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.14

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Shukla,Brahmi

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1027/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	735/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	763/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	641/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	371/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	209/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1165/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	691/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1249/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1250/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1261/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1151/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	3.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	709/1236	4.32	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	396/1121	4.25	3.61	4.18	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	857/1122	4.17	3.88	4.36	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	855/1121	4.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Shukla,Brahmi

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	138/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	36/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	111/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	127/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	139/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.14

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	6	2	3.80	1237/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1061/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1207/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1306/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	766/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1208/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	2	3	3.30	1329/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	758/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	614/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1116/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	3.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	437/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	508/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	415/1236	4.32	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1121	4.25	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1122	4.17	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1121	4.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	138/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	163/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	158/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	162/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	173/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.61	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2
			Required for Majors	8	Graduate
				0	Major
					1

Run Date: 7/14/2011 11:14:18 AM

Page 314 of 419

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2									
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General		0	Under-grad	10	Non-major			9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	3									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Peters,Hanna

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	6	2	3.80	1237/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1061/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	1207/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1306/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	766/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1208/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	2	3	3.30	1329/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1311/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	1341/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1387/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	3.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	0	1	3	3.43	1288/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1053/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	4.32	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1121	4.25	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1122	4.17	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1121	4.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Peters,Hanna

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	138/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	163/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	158/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.29
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	162/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	173/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.61	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1

Run Date: 7/14/2011 11:14:18 AM

Page 317 of 419

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Peters,Hanna

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	11
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2									
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General		0	Under-grad	10	Non-major			9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives		0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0									
				I	0	Other		0						
				?	3									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	821/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	505/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	519/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	143/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	438/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	847/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	430/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	566/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	669/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	614/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	576/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	355/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	492/1236	4.32	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	4.25	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1122	4.17	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	4.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	86/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	113/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	41/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	157/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	173/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	821/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	505/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	519/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	143/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	438/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	847/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	430/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	566/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1172/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	929/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1300/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	946/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	492/1236	4.32	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	4.25	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1122	4.17	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	4.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	86/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	113/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	41/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	157/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.20
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	173/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1065/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	885/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1054/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	963/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	1	4	3.33	1232/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	847/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	868/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	10	2	4.08	822/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	462/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	710/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	477/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	776/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	678/1236	4.32	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1121	4.25	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1122	4.17	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1121	4.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	32/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	12/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	24/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	48/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	28/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sesmero,Ester

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1065/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	885/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1054/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	963/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	1	4	3.33	1232/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	847/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	868/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1138/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	878/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	787/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	518/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	926/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	127/1236	4.32	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1121	4.25	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1122	4.17	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1121	4.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	32/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Sesmero,Ester

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	12/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	24/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	48/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	28/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	821/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	776/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	528/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	827/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1264/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1262/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	550/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1002/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	4.32	3.87	4.08	4.18	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	49/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	88/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	145/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 351L 08	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 5
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab I		Questionnaires: 3
Instructor: Perks,Harry M		

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Guei,Jules

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	821/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	776/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	528/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	827/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1264/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1262/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	550/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1162/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.58
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	49/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	88/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	145/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0

Run Date: 7/14/2011 11:14:18 AM

Page 329 of 419

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Guei,Jules

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	5
Questionnaires:	3

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General			0	Under-grad	3	Non-major		3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0									
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives			0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				P	0									
				I	0	Other			0					
				?	1									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	594/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	863/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	519/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	810/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	628/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	404/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	479/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	788/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	226/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	462/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	437/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	385/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	709/1236	4.32	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	68/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

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

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	4

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Guei,Jules

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	594/1449	4.27	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	863/1446	4.33	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	519/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	810/1402	4.24	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	628/1358	4.16	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	404/1327	4.04	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	479/1435	4.11	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	788/1446	4.95	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	550/1437	4.09	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1177/1386	4.42	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1162/1390	4.55	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1261/1379	4.23	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1379	4.49	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/200	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.44	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/205	4.59	4.48	4.29	4.44	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/201	4.72	4.64	4.51	4.59	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/202	4.48	4.54	4.42	4.48	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	68/196	4.24	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 351L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab I
Instructor:	Guei,Jules

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	4

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

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352 1
Title:	Organic Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	176
Questionnaires:	93

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	4	19	67	4.67	362/1449	4.65	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	8	16	65	4.61	425/1446	4.50	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	10	20	57	4.44	594/1256	4.33	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	17	0	1	6	18	48	4.55	480/1402	4.44	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	13	0	4	10	15	48	4.39	502/1358	4.38	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	30	0	2	5	15	38	4.48	428/1327	4.30	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	4	8	20	57	4.46	532/1435	4.39	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	2	13	74	4.81	728/1446	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	0	0	8	31	37	4.38	493/1437	4.26	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	10	79	4.89	237/1386	4.89	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	5	83	4.92	425/1390	4.89	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	4	16	65	4.69	410/1379	4.58	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	4	12	70	4.65	520/1379	4.64	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	11	2	3	7	13	51	4.42	415/1236	4.35	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	84	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	****/1121	****	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	84	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	****/1122	****	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	84	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	****/1121	****	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	84	2	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352 1
Title:	Organic Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	176
Questionnaires:	93

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/200	****	4.37	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	****	4.48	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/201	****	4.64	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	92	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/202	****	4.54	4.42	4.48	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1 A 20	Required for Majors	74	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0 B 31						
56-83	22	2.00-2.99	4 C 21	General	0	Under-grad	93	Non-major	89
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	15 D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	36 F 1	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			0 P						
			0 I	Other	1				
			13 ?						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352 2
Title:	Organic Chemistry II
Instructor:	Gierasch, Tiffan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	95
Questionnaires:	49

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	12	34	4.63	418/1449	4.65	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	17	26	4.39	724/1446	4.50	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	10	18	21	4.22	805/1256	4.33	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	7	13	21	4.34	725/1402	4.44	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	5	13	27	4.36	521/1358	4.38	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	9	0	0	9	15	13	4.11	792/1327	4.30	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	7	15	24	4.32	709/1435	4.39	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	40	4.85	627/1446	4.83	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	6	20	15	4.14	758/1437	4.26	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	40	4.89	237/1386	4.89	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	6	39	4.87	633/1390	4.89	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	5	14	26	4.47	689/1379	4.58	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	5	7	33	4.62	555/1379	4.64	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	8	10	23	4.29	531/1236	4.35	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1121	****	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	45	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1122	****	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	45	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1121	****	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	45	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 352 2	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 95
Title: Organic Chemistry II		Questionnaires: 49
Instructor: Gierasch, Tiffan		

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	38	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	17						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	49	Non-major	44
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	12						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	903/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	411/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	411/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	281/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	827/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	337/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1084/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	868/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	163/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	211/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	88/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L O2
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Talley,Dan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	903/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	411/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	411/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	281/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	827/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	337/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1084/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	105/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	462/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1002/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 02
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Talley,Dan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	88/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	821/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	776/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	717/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	827/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	253/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	687/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	550/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	462/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	872/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	635/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	688/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	492/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	72/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	27/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	123/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	48/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	20/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Temburnikar, Kar

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	821/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	776/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	717/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	827/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	253/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	687/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1311/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	72/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	27/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	123/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	48/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	20/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 03
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Temburnikar, Kar

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	4

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	527/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	896/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	190/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	528/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	328/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	944/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1076/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	780/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	237/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	437/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	508/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	331/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	746/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	134/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	120/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	63/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	41/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	106/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	20/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Guei,Jules

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	527/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	896/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	190/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	528/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	328/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	944/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1076/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1117/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1256/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	787/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1261/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	900/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	746/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	134/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	4.67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 04
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Guei,Jules

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	10
Questionnaires:	9

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	120/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.20
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	63/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	41/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	106/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	20/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1007/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	970/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1102/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1319/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	827/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	962/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	5	0	3.29	1333/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	868/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1030/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	2.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	940/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	3.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	743/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	3.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	875/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	2.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	709/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	182/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	3.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	163/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	41/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	180/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	177/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	3.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Peters,Hannah

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1007/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	970/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1102/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1319/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	827/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	962/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	5	0	3.29	1333/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	1351/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1385/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	2.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1389/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	3.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1378/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	3.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1379/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	2.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	182/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	3.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	163/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 05
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Peters,Hannah

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	7
Questionnaires:	7

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	41/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	180/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	177/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	3.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	594/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	690/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	784/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1121/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	698/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	847/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	769/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	6	1	3.73	1138/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	764/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	761/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	805/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	737/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	709/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	32/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	85/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	162/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	164/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	124/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	12

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 06
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Shukla,Brahmi

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	15
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	594/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	690/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	784/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1121/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	698/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	847/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	769/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	5	1	3.56	1223/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1319/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1331/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1172/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1053/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	32/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	85/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	162/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	164/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	124/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: CHEM 352L 06	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 15
Title: Organic Chemistry Lab II		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Shukla,Brahmi		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1217/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1185/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	819/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1185/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	4	3	3.38	1212/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	986/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	1109/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1117/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	989/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1002/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	902/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	1053/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	0	6	2	3.70	938/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	116/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	74/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	133/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	166/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	49/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Temburnikar, Kar

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1217/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1185/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	819/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1185/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	4	3	3.38	1212/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	986/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	1109/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	0	5	4	1	3.17	1351/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1303/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1366/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1311/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1254/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 07
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Temburnikar, Kar

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	116/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	74/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	133/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	166/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	49/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	219/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	763/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	613/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	267/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	290/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	898/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	504/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	462/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	316/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	555/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	709/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	21/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	48/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	34/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	68/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	68/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	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	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P	0						
			I	0	Other	0				
			?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Arthur, John

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	219/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	763/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	613/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	267/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	290/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	898/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	550/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	371/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	787/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	518/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1078/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 08
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Arthur, John

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	10

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	21/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.83
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	48/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	34/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	68/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	68/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	594/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	735/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	675/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	781/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	267/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	404/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	898/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	586/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	758/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	287/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	659/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	370/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	766/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	185/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	49/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	48/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	88/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	68/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	68/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Thakur,Sona

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	594/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	735/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	675/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	781/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	267/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	404/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	898/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	586/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	758/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	803/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	872/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	635/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	385/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	220/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 09
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Thakur,Sona

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	49/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	48/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	88/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	68/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	68/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1106/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1180/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1123/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1189/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	827/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	847/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1182/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	627/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1145/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	735/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	940/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	989/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	766/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	492/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	97/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	152/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	151/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	68/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	39/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Talley,Dan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1106/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1180/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1123/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1189/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	827/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	847/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1182/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	627/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	226/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	462/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	787/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	385/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 10
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Talley,Dan

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	17
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	97/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	152/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	151/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	68/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	39/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	567/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	819/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	0	0	3	8	4.15	857/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	528/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	530/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	290/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	155/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	573/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	676/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	564/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	3	11	4.38	807/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	304/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	57/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	58/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	100/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	48/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	39/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Cummings,Ben

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	567/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	819/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	2	0	0	3	8	4.15	857/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	528/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	530/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	290/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	155/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	279/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	287/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	187/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	239/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	57/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.63

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 11
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Cummings,Ben

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	58/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	100/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	48/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	39/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	771/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	735/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	644/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	716/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	618/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	0	5	7	4.14	756/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	572/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	691/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	354/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	729/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	415/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	185/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	49/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	67/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	58/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	31/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	6/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Arthur,John

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	771/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	735/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	644/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	716/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	618/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	0	5	7	4.14	756/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	572/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	279/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	163/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	684/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	541/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	688/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 12
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Arthur, John

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	49/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	67/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	58/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	31/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	6/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 2		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	705/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	479/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	569/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	655/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	717/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	0	8	4.33	591/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	666/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	616/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	726/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	872/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	635/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	688/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	394/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Perks,Harry M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	92/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	121/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	18/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	96/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	11/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Graduate	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 4		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	Under-grad	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
			Required for Majors 12		
			General 0		
			Electives 0		
			Other 0		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Thakur,Sona

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	705/1449	4.36	4.01	4.33	4.38	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	479/1446	4.32	4.03	4.29	4.33	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	569/1256	4.27	3.95	4.34	4.39	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	655/1402	4.21	3.85	4.27	4.37	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	717/1358	4.18	3.89	4.13	4.14	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	0	8	4.33	591/1327	4.25	3.75	4.16	4.23	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	666/1435	4.09	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1446	4.98	4.72	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	803/1437	4.05	3.90	4.12	4.14	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	676/1386	4.43	4.33	4.48	4.53	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	607/1390	4.64	4.50	4.74	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	316/1379	4.34	4.14	4.34	4.38	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	239/1379	4.37	4.08	4.36	4.40	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	436/1236	4.39	3.87	4.08	4.18	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1122	4.75	3.88	4.36	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/790	4.83	3.65	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 352L 13
Title:	Organic Chemistry Lab II
Instructor:	Thakur,Sona

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	92/200	4.43	4.37	4.28	4.44	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	121/205	4.51	4.48	4.29	4.44	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	18/201	4.63	4.64	4.51	4.59	4.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	96/202	4.53	4.54	4.42	4.48	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	11/196	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.37	4.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 401 1
Title:	Chem/Stat Thermodynamics
Instructor:	Kelly,Lisa A

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	258/1449	4.77	4.01	4.33	4.46	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	885/1446	4.23	4.03	4.29	4.34	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	907/1256	4.08	3.95	4.34	4.43	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	947/1402	4.11	3.85	4.27	4.35	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	827/1358	4.00	3.89	4.13	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	553/1327	4.38	3.75	4.16	4.28	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	131/1435	4.85	3.91	4.20	4.27	4.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	7	1	3.69	1422/1446	3.69	4.72	4.67	4.71	3.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	585/1437	4.30	3.90	4.12	4.20	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	803/1386	4.50	4.33	4.48	4.55	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.50	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	902/1379	4.25	4.14	4.34	4.40	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	267/1379	4.83	4.08	4.36	4.44	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	910/1236	3.75	3.87	4.08	4.13	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	727/1121	4.00	3.61	4.18	4.39	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	857/1122	4.00	3.88	4.36	4.54	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	694/1121	4.40	3.67	4.40	4.60	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 401 1
Title:	Chem/Stat Thermodynamics
Instructor:	Kelly,Lisa A

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	13

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 405 1
Title:	Inorganic Chemistry
Instructor:	Onuta,Marie-Chr

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	38
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	10	22	4.64	418/1449	4.64	4.01	4.33	4.46	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	23	4.64	397/1446	4.64	4.03	4.29	4.34	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	157/1256	4.88	3.95	4.34	4.43	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	0	0	5	17	4.61	408/1402	4.61	3.85	4.27	4.35	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	5	1	3	4	10	3.57	1144/1358	3.57	3.89	4.13	4.21	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	318/1327	4.59	3.75	4.16	4.28	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	23	4.58	411/1435	4.58	3.91	4.20	4.27	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	18	4.55	991/1446	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.71	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	15	11	4.28	616/1437	4.28	3.90	4.12	4.20	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	29	4.91	204/1386	4.91	4.33	4.48	4.55	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	684/1390	4.84	4.50	4.74	4.78	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	5	22	4.53	599/1379	4.53	4.14	4.34	4.40	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	340/1379	4.78	4.08	4.36	4.44	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	1	6	6	9	3.91	811/1236	3.91	3.87	4.08	4.13	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	693/1121	4.11	3.61	4.18	4.39	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	691/1122	4.33	3.88	4.36	4.54	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	829/1121	4.11	3.67	4.40	4.60	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	24	3	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 405 1
Title:	Inorganic Chemistry
Instructor:	Onuta,Marie-Chr

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	38
Questionnaires:	33

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	9	Major	28
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	5
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 2
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	594/1449	4.68	4.01	4.33	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	285/1446	4.68	4.03	4.29	4.34	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	334/1256	4.67	3.95	4.34	4.43	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	781/1402	4.25	3.85	4.27	4.35	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	827/1358	4.00	3.89	4.13	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	572/1327	4.45	3.75	4.16	4.28	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	479/1435	4.29	3.91	4.20	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	200/1437	4.23	3.90	4.12	4.20	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	163/1386	4.52	4.33	4.48	4.55	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1390	4.86	4.50	4.74	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	199/1379	4.73	4.14	4.34	4.40	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1379	4.64	4.08	4.36	4.44	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	331/1236	4.19	3.87	4.08	4.13	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1122	5.00	3.88	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 2
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	32/200	4.88	4.37	4.28	4.11	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/205	4.86	4.48	4.29	3.91	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	16/201	4.89	4.64	4.51	4.19	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	31/202	4.92	4.54	4.42	3.90	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	98/196	4.35	4.37	4.25	3.43	4.42

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 2
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Brown,Jodian

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	594/1449	4.68	4.01	4.33	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	285/1446	4.68	4.03	4.29	4.34	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	334/1256	4.67	3.95	4.34	4.43	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	2	9	4.29	781/1402	4.25	3.85	4.27	4.35	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	827/1358	4.00	3.89	4.13	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	572/1327	4.45	3.75	4.16	4.28	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	479/1435	4.29	3.91	4.20	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	10	3	0	3.23	1338/1437	4.23	3.90	4.12	4.20	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1319/1386	4.52	4.33	4.48	4.55	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	787/1390	4.86	4.50	4.74	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1379	4.73	4.14	4.34	4.40	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1379	4.64	4.08	4.36	4.44	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1122	5.00	3.88	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.27	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	32/200	4.88	4.37	4.28	4.11	4.75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 2
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Brown,Jodian

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/205	4.86	4.48	4.29	3.91	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	16/201	4.89	4.64	4.51	4.19	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	31/202	4.92	4.54	4.42	3.90	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	98/196	4.35	4.37	4.25	3.43	4.42

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 3
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	175/1449	4.68	4.01	4.33	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	382/1446	4.68	4.03	4.29	4.34	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	389/1256	4.67	3.95	4.34	4.43	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	849/1402	4.25	3.85	4.27	4.35	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	827/1358	4.00	3.89	4.13	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	375/1327	4.45	3.75	4.16	4.28	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	933/1435	4.29	3.91	4.20	4.27	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/1437	4.23	3.90	4.12	4.20	4.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1386	4.52	4.33	4.48	4.55	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	425/1390	4.86	4.50	4.74	4.78	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	302/1379	4.73	4.14	4.34	4.40	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	531/1379	4.64	4.08	4.36	4.44	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	0	1	0	6	3.89	834/1236	4.19	3.87	4.08	4.13	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.39	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1122	5.00	3.88	4.36	4.54	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 3
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/200	4.88	4.37	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	36/205	4.86	4.48	4.29	3.91	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	29/201	4.89	4.64	4.51	4.19	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/202	4.92	4.54	4.42	3.90	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	119/196	4.35	4.37	4.25	3.43	4.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	4.09	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.42	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.08	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.96	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.20	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 3
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Tracy,Allison M

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	3.94	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 3
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Seeger, Franzisk

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	175/1449	4.68	4.01	4.33	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	382/1446	4.68	4.03	4.29	4.34	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	389/1256	4.67	3.95	4.34	4.43	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	849/1402	4.25	3.85	4.27	4.35	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	827/1358	4.00	3.89	4.13	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	375/1327	4.45	3.75	4.16	4.28	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	933/1435	4.29	3.91	4.20	4.27	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	780/1437	4.23	3.90	4.12	4.20	4.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	614/1386	4.52	4.33	4.48	4.55	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	940/1390	4.86	4.50	4.74	4.78	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	553/1379	4.73	4.14	4.34	4.40	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	875/1379	4.64	4.08	4.36	4.44	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1236	4.19	3.87	4.08	4.13	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.61	4.18	4.39	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1122	5.00	3.88	4.36	4.54	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1121	5.00	3.67	4.40	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 3
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Seeger, Franzisk

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/200	4.88	4.37	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	36/205	4.86	4.48	4.29	3.91	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	29/201	4.89	4.64	4.51	4.19	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/202	4.92	4.54	4.42	3.90	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	119/196	4.35	4.37	4.25	3.43	4.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.60	4.36	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	4.33	4.25	4.24	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	4.08	4.32	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.58	4.00	4.09	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.42	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	4.16	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.08	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.96	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.20	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.98	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 437L 3
Title:	Biochemistry Laboratory
Instructor:	Seeger, Franzisk

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	3.94	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 438 1
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem II
Instructor:	Fishbein,James

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	87
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	527/1449	4.56	4.01	4.33	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	9	4	3.89	1162/1446	3.89	4.03	4.29	4.34	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	7	5	3.78	1070/1256	3.78	3.95	4.34	4.43	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1210/1402	3.67	3.85	4.27	4.35	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	796/1358	4.06	3.89	4.13	4.21	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	924/1327	3.92	3.75	4.16	4.28	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	5	6	5	3.67	1209/1435	3.67	3.91	4.20	4.27	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	5	6	4.00	868/1437	3.56	3.90	4.12	4.20	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	1	13	4.50	803/1386	4.22	4.33	4.48	4.55	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	1116/1390	4.33	4.50	4.74	4.78	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	928/1379	3.69	4.14	4.34	4.40	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	13	4.50	688/1379	4.00	4.08	4.36	4.44	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1236	3.73	3.87	4.08	4.13	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1121	****	3.61	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1122	****	3.88	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1121	****	3.67	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 438 1
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem II
Instructor:	Fishbein,James

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	87
Questionnaires:	19

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 438 1
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem II
Instructor:	Karpel,R L

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	87
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	527/1449	4.56	4.01	4.33	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	9	4	3.89	1162/1446	3.89	4.03	4.29	4.34	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	7	5	3.78	1070/1256	3.78	3.95	4.34	4.43	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1210/1402	3.67	3.85	4.27	4.35	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	796/1358	4.06	3.89	4.13	4.21	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	924/1327	3.92	3.75	4.16	4.28	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	5	6	5	3.67	1209/1435	3.67	3.91	4.20	4.27	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	14	3	0	3.11	1357/1437	3.56	3.90	4.12	4.20	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	6	7	5	3.94	1211/1386	4.22	4.33	4.48	4.55	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	1314/1390	4.33	4.50	4.74	4.78	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	6	4	3	3.17	1327/1379	3.69	4.14	4.34	4.40	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	6	5	4	3.50	1254/1379	4.00	4.08	4.36	4.44	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	2	2	5	5	3.73	921/1236	3.73	3.87	4.08	4.13	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1121	****	3.61	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1122	****	3.88	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1121	****	3.67	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 438 1
Title:	Comprehensive Biochem II
Instructor:	Karpel,R L

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	87
Questionnaires:	19

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 455 1
Title:	Intro Biomedical Chem
Instructor:	Radtke,Katherin

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	119
Questionnaires:	68

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	1	3	15	45	4.57	513/1449	4.57	4.01	4.33	4.46	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	2	21	40	4.52	544/1446	4.52	4.03	4.29	4.34	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	0	23	40	4.54	493/1256	4.54	3.95	4.34	4.43	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	5	1	1	4	11	42	4.56	468/1402	4.56	3.85	4.27	4.35	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	5	9	16	33	4.17	708/1358	4.17	3.89	4.13	4.21	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	31	0	2	2	11	19	4.38	543/1327	4.38	3.75	4.16	4.28	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	4	10	49	4.67	302/1435	4.67	3.91	4.20	4.27	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	2	25	38	4.55	984/1446	4.55	4.72	4.67	4.71	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	1	2	22	29	4.46	406/1437	4.46	3.90	4.12	4.20	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	2	5	13	40	4.52	793/1386	4.52	4.33	4.48	4.55	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	5	53	4.88	582/1390	4.88	4.50	4.74	4.78	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	6	20	32	4.45	716/1379	4.45	4.14	4.34	4.40	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	3	3	14	39	4.51	688/1379	4.51	4.08	4.36	4.44	4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	12	1	4	5	15	21	4.11	675/1236	4.11	3.87	4.08	4.13	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	57	0	2	0	1	2	6	3.91	****/1121	****	3.61	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	57	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	****/1122	****	3.88	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	57	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	****/1121	****	3.67	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	57	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 455 1
Title:	Intro Biomedical Chem
Instructor:	Radtke,Katherin

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	119
Questionnaires:	68

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	30	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	2	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	66	Non-major	62
84-150	24	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	22	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	11						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 2
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Cullum,Brian

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	594/1449	4.50	4.01	4.33	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	479/1446	4.57	4.03	4.29	4.34	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	458/1256	4.57	3.95	4.34	4.43	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	859/1402	4.20	3.85	4.27	4.35	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1060/1358	3.73	3.89	4.13	4.21	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	792/1327	4.10	3.75	4.16	4.28	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	479/1435	4.50	3.91	4.20	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	118/1437	3.95	3.90	4.12	4.20	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1386	4.66	4.33	4.48	4.55	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	659/1390	4.49	4.50	4.74	4.78	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	275/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.40	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	135/1379	3.79	4.08	4.36	4.44	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	681/1236	4.08	3.87	4.08	4.13	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1121	****	3.61	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1122	****	3.88	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1121	****	3.67	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 2
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Cullum,Brian

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	153/200	4.00	4.37	4.28	4.11	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	163/205	4.00	4.48	4.29	3.91	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	168/201	4.20	4.64	4.51	4.19	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	180/202	3.80	4.54	4.42	3.90	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	1	1	5	1	3.20	182/196	3.20	4.37	4.25	3.43	3.20

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 2
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Mang,Stephen

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	594/1449	4.50	4.01	4.33	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	479/1446	4.57	4.03	4.29	4.34	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	458/1256	4.57	3.95	4.34	4.43	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	859/1402	4.20	3.85	4.27	4.35	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1060/1358	3.73	3.89	4.13	4.21	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	792/1327	4.10	3.75	4.16	4.28	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	479/1435	4.50	3.91	4.20	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1201/1437	3.95	3.90	4.12	4.20	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	929/1386	4.66	4.33	4.48	4.55	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1070/1390	4.49	4.50	4.74	4.78	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1323/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.40	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1334/1379	3.79	4.08	4.36	4.44	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1236	4.08	3.87	4.08	4.13	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1121	****	3.61	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1122	****	3.88	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1121	****	3.67	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.27	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 2
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Mang, Stephen

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	153/200	4.00	4.37	4.28	4.11	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	163/205	4.00	4.48	4.29	3.91	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	168/201	4.20	4.64	4.51	4.19	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	180/202	3.80	4.54	4.42	3.90	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	1	1	5	1	3.20	182/196	3.20	4.37	4.25	3.43	3.20

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 2
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Federowski, Jen

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	594/1449	4.50	4.01	4.33	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	479/1446	4.57	4.03	4.29	4.34	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	458/1256	4.57	3.95	4.34	4.43	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	859/1402	4.20	3.85	4.27	4.35	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1060/1358	3.73	3.89	4.13	4.21	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	792/1327	4.10	3.75	4.16	4.28	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	479/1435	4.50	3.91	4.20	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1288/1437	3.95	3.90	4.12	4.20	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	803/1386	4.66	4.33	4.48	4.55	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1276/1390	4.49	4.50	4.74	4.78	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1261/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.40	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1254/1379	3.79	4.08	4.36	4.44	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1121	****	3.61	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1122	****	3.88	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1121	****	3.67	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.27	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	153/200	4.00	4.37	4.28	4.11	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 2
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Federowski, Jen

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	163/205	4.00	4.48	4.29	3.91	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	168/201	4.20	4.64	4.51	4.19	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	180/202	3.80	4.54	4.42	3.90	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	1	1	5	1	3.20	182/196	3.20	4.37	4.25	3.43	3.20

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 2
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	594/1449	4.50	4.01	4.33	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	479/1446	4.57	4.03	4.29	4.34	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	458/1256	4.57	3.95	4.34	4.43	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	859/1402	4.20	3.85	4.27	4.35	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1060/1358	3.73	3.89	4.13	4.21	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	792/1327	4.10	3.75	4.16	4.28	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	479/1435	4.50	3.91	4.20	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	868/1437	3.95	3.90	4.12	4.20	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	462/1386	4.66	4.33	4.48	4.55	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1276/1390	4.49	4.50	4.74	4.78	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1190/1379	3.81	4.14	4.34	4.40	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1182/1379	3.79	4.08	4.36	4.44	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1121	****	3.61	4.18	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1122	****	3.88	4.36	4.54	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1121	****	3.67	4.40	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/790	****	3.65	4.06	4.27	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	153/200	4.00	4.37	4.28	4.11	4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 461 2
Title:	Adv Instrumental Methods
Instructor:	Wassink,Sarah

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	163/205	4.00	4.48	4.29	3.91	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	168/201	4.20	4.64	4.51	4.19	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	180/202	3.80	4.54	4.42	3.90	3.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	1	1	5	1	3.20	182/196	3.20	4.37	4.25	3.43	3.20

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 490 01
Title:	Special Topics In Chem
Instructor:	Garcin,Elsa D.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	821/1449	4.33	4.01	4.33	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	354/1446	4.67	4.03	4.29	4.34	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	784/1256	4.25	3.95	4.34	4.43	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	898/1402	4.17	3.85	4.27	4.35	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	483/1358	4.40	3.89	4.13	4.21	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	591/1327	4.33	3.75	4.16	4.28	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	970/1435	4.00	3.91	4.20	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1151/1446	4.33	4.72	4.67	4.71	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	868/1437	4.00	3.90	4.12	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.33	4.48	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.50	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1058/1379	4.00	4.14	4.34	4.40	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	267/1379	4.83	4.08	4.36	4.44	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	624/1236	4.17	3.87	4.08	4.13	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	662/1121	4.17	3.61	4.18	4.39	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	404/1122	4.67	3.88	4.36	4.54	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	731/1121	4.33	3.67	4.40	4.60	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	681/790	3.33	3.65	4.06	4.27	3.33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 490 01
Title:	Special Topics In Chem
Instructor:	Garcin,Elsa D.

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	6

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

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 690 1
Title:	Chemistry Seminar
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	5

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1377/1449	3.40	4.01	4.33	4.41	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	704/1446	4.40	4.03	4.29	4.30	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	528/1402	4.50	3.85	4.27	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1358	****	3.89	4.13	4.18	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1435	5.00	3.91	4.20	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.72	4.67	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1117/1437	3.75	3.90	4.12	4.17	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1386	****	4.33	4.48	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1390	****	4.50	4.74	4.77	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1379	****	4.14	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1379	****	4.08	4.36	4.35	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.50	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/66	5.00	4.60	4.36	4.36	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/64	4.67	4.33	4.25	4.32	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	38/75	4.50	4.08	4.32	4.37	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	17/73	4.75	3.58	4.00	4.02	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 2	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 690 1
Title:	Chemistry Seminar
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	6
Questionnaires:	5

Questions			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General			0	Under-grad	5	Non-major		2
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	4									
				I	0	Other			0					
				?	1									

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	CHEM 713 1
Title:	Biochem Seminar
Instructor:	Ptaszek, Marcin

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	8
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1432/1449	2.75	4.01	4.33	4.41	2.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1428/1446	2.75	4.03	4.29	4.30	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1385/1402	2.67	3.85	4.27	4.26	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	1312/1327	2.50	3.75	4.16	4.29	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1435	5.00	3.91	4.20	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	788/1446	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.81	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1245/1437	3.50	3.90	4.12	4.17	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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