

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	10	13	53	65	66	3.79	1230/1481	3.79	4.27	4.29	4.14	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	10	12	52	68	63	3.79	1184/1481	3.79	4.12	4.23	4.18	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	12	18	32	75	69	3.83	1009/1249	3.83	4.12	4.27	4.14	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	71	7	19	33	46	29	3.53	1268/1424	3.53	4.05	4.21	4.06	3.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	16	8	9	36	65	72	3.97	744/1396	3.97	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	88	17	18	40	25	18	3.08	1259/1342	3.08	3.77	4.07	3.88	3.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	7	22	41	67	68	3.81	1117/1459	3.81	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	2	1	0	4	195	4.93	561/1480	4.93	4.84	4.68	4.64	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	41	3	15	15	66	52	19	3.27	1304/1450	3.27	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	3	5	23	64	109	4.33	979/1409	4.33	4.36	4.42	4.36	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	3	3	16	37	147	4.56	1061/1407	4.56	4.54	4.69	4.57	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	8	18	42	80	56	3.77	1156/1399	3.77	4.12	4.26	4.23	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	2	13	19	43	54	74	3.77	1135/1400	3.77	4.14	4.27	4.19	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	10	11	34	52	93	4.03	580/1179	4.04	3.89	3.96	3.85	4.03	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	9	9	27	51	103	4.16	638/1262	4.16	3.70	4.05	3.77	4.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	4	5	7	47	136	4.54	564/1259	4.54	4.00	4.29	4.06	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	3	17	21	46	112	4.24	779/1256	4.24	3.88	4.30	4.08	4.24	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	11	13	25	59	87	4.02	391/ 788	4.02	3.82	4.00	3.80	4.02	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	204	2	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	206	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	208	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	207	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	208	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.29	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	207	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	208	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	208	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	208	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	208	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	208	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	208	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	208	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	208	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	208	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	208	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	208	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	208	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	208	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	208	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL
 Enrollment: 267
 Questionnaires: 211

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 141
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	60	0.00-0.99	0	A	62	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	1	Major	61
28-55	37	1.00-1.99	5	B	62						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	38	C	52	General	4	Under-grad	210	Non-major	150
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	31	D	5						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	52	F	1	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	147				
				?	8						

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 142
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	947/1481	4.17	4.27	4.29	4.14	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1160/1481	3.83	4.12	4.23	4.18	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.12	4.27	4.14	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1352/1424	3.11	4.05	4.21	4.06	3.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	7	4	4.08	655/1396	4.08	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	2	5	1	3.30	1195/1342	3.30	3.77	4.07	3.88	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	0	6	4	3.83	1101/1459	3.83	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	1	6	3	0	2.83	1394/1450	3.50	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.50	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	1	5	4	3.75	1251/1409	4.13	4.36	4.42	4.36	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	1257/1407	4.38	4.54	4.69	4.57	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	5	2	3.75	1163/1399	3.93	4.12	4.26	4.23	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1209/1400	3.85	4.14	4.27	4.19	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	3	2	3	4	3.67	840/1179	3.61	3.89	3.96	3.85	3.61	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	680/1262	4.08	3.70	4.05	3.77	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.00	4.29	4.06	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	868/1256	4.08	3.88	4.30	4.08	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	372/ 788	4.09	3.82	4.00	3.80	4.09	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 143
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	947/1481	4.17	4.27	4.29	4.14	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1160/1481	3.83	4.12	4.23	4.18	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	5	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.12	4.27	4.14	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1352/1424	3.11	4.05	4.21	4.06	3.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	7	4	4.08	655/1396	4.08	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	2	5	1	3.30	1195/1342	3.30	3.77	4.07	3.88	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	0	6	4	3.83	1101/1459	3.83	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	722/1450	3.50	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.50	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	762/1409	4.13	4.36	4.42	4.36	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1107/1407	4.38	4.54	4.69	4.57	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	966/1399	3.93	4.12	4.26	4.23	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	977/1400	3.85	4.14	4.27	4.19	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	2	5	1	3.56	877/1179	3.61	3.89	3.96	3.85	3.61	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	680/1262	4.08	3.70	4.05	3.77	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.00	4.29	4.06	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	868/1256	4.08	3.88	4.30	4.08	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	372/ 788	4.09	3.82	4.00	3.80	4.09	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	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 9	
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 144
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1037/1481	3.62	4.27	4.29	4.14	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	6	5	3.72	1221/1481	3.71	4.12	4.23	4.18	3.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	6	6	3.78	1036/1249	3.59	4.12	4.27	4.14	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	7	4.00	959/1424	3.67	4.05	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	633/1396	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	9	4	3.82	941/1342	3.56	3.77	4.07	3.88	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	2	2	9	3.82	1109/1459	3.97	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	811/1480	4.88	4.84	4.68	4.64	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	2	7	2	1	3.17	1329/1450	3.07	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	8	4	3.89	1222/1409	3.88	4.36	4.42	4.36	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	5	8	4	3.78	1342/1407	3.87	4.54	4.69	4.57	3.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	8	3	3.72	1174/1399	3.69	4.12	4.26	4.23	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	5	4	2	3.13	1302/1400	3.19	4.14	4.27	4.19	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	786/1179	3.49	3.89	3.96	3.85	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1262	2.71	3.70	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1127/1259	3.16	4.00	4.29	4.06	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1216/1256	2.91	3.88	4.30	4.08	2.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	2.75	3.82	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	152/ 246	4.04	4.43	4.20	3.93	4.07	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	102/ 249	4.01	4.45	4.11	3.95	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	159/ 242	4.40	4.54	4.40	4.33	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	82/ 240	4.37	4.53	4.20	4.20	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	81/ 217	3.96	4.29	4.04	4.02	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 144
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other 12	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 145
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1037/1481	3.62	4.27	4.29	4.14	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	6	5	3.72	1221/1481	3.71	4.12	4.23	4.18	3.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	6	6	3.78	1036/1249	3.59	4.12	4.27	4.14	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	7	4.00	959/1424	3.67	4.05	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	633/1396	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	9	4	3.82	941/1342	3.56	3.77	4.07	3.88	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	2	2	9	3.82	1109/1459	3.97	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	811/1480	4.88	4.84	4.68	4.64	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1450	3.07	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1281/1409	3.88	4.36	4.42	4.36	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1407	3.87	4.54	4.69	4.57	3.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1399	3.69	4.12	4.26	4.23	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1400	3.19	4.14	4.27	4.19	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1179	3.49	3.89	3.96	3.85	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1262	2.71	3.70	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1127/1259	3.16	4.00	4.29	4.06	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1216/1256	2.91	3.88	4.30	4.08	2.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	2.75	3.82	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	152/ 246	4.04	4.43	4.20	3.93	4.07	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	102/ 249	4.01	4.45	4.11	3.95	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	159/ 242	4.40	4.54	4.40	4.33	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	82/ 240	4.37	4.53	4.20	4.20	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	81/ 217	3.96	4.29	4.04	4.02	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 145
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other 12	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0102
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 146
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	3	6	7	5	3.67	1299/1481	3.62	4.27	4.29	4.14	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	11	5	3.90	1118/1481	3.71	4.12	4.23	4.18	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	7	8	4.00	893/1249	3.59	4.12	4.27	4.14	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	684/1424	3.67	4.05	4.21	4.06	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	363/1396	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	573/1342	3.56	3.77	4.07	3.88	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	402/1459	3.97	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	729/1480	4.88	4.84	4.68	4.64	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	4	0	2	9	3	1	3.20	1320/1450	3.07	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	1013/1409	3.88	4.36	4.42	4.36	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	6	6	7	3.86	1331/1407	3.87	4.54	4.69	4.57	3.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	10	5	3.90	1096/1399	3.69	4.12	4.26	4.23	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	6	3	5	3.39	1259/1400	3.19	4.14	4.27	4.19	3.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	4	9	2	6	3.48	909/1179	3.49	3.89	3.96	3.85	3.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	995/1262	2.71	3.70	4.05	3.77	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	992/1259	3.16	4.00	4.29	4.06	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1128/1256	2.91	3.88	4.30	4.08	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 788	2.75	3.82	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	124/ 246	4.04	4.43	4.20	3.93	4.29	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	83/ 249	4.01	4.45	4.11	3.95	4.47	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	113/ 242	4.40	4.54	4.40	4.33	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	79/ 240	4.37	4.53	4.20	4.20	4.69	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	46/ 217	3.96	4.29	4.04	4.02	4.69	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0102
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 146
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0103
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 147
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	3	3	6	5	3.61	1319/1481	3.62	4.27	4.29	4.14	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	8	3	7	3.94	1070/1481	3.71	4.12	4.23	4.18	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	4	8	3.89	988/1249	3.59	4.12	4.27	4.14	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	2	6	6	3.72	1202/1424	3.67	4.05	4.21	4.06	3.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	7	1	7	3.76	909/1396	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	6	2	7	3.67	1039/1342	3.56	3.77	4.07	3.88	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	854/1459	3.97	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.88	4.84	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	2	8	3	0	2.93	1379/1450	3.07	3.87	4.09	3.97	2.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	7	2	6	3.65	1274/1409	3.88	4.36	4.42	4.36	3.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	6	5	4	3.59	1364/1407	3.87	4.54	4.69	4.57	3.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	3	8	3	3.75	1163/1399	3.69	4.12	4.26	4.23	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	3	4	2	3	3.07	1309/1400	3.19	4.14	4.27	4.19	3.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	4	4	5	3	3.29	986/1179	3.49	3.89	3.96	3.85	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1092/1262	2.71	3.70	4.05	3.77	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1162/1259	3.16	4.00	4.29	4.06	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	1227/1256	2.91	3.88	4.30	4.08	2.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 788	2.75	3.82	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	175/ 246	4.04	4.43	4.20	3.93	3.93	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	2	9	2	3.79	176/ 249	4.01	4.45	4.11	3.95	3.79	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	148/ 242	4.40	4.54	4.40	4.33	4.38	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	5	1	8	4.21	151/ 240	4.37	4.53	4.20	4.20	4.21	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	149/ 217	3.96	4.29	4.04	4.02	3.79	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0103
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 147
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0104
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 148
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1432/1481	3.62	4.27	4.29	4.14	3.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1371/1481	3.71	4.12	4.23	4.18	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1177/1249	3.59	4.12	4.27	4.14	3.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1138/1424	3.67	4.05	4.21	4.06	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1167/1396	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1186/1342	3.56	3.77	4.07	3.88	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1101/1459	3.97	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	4.88	4.84	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.07	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1232/1409	3.88	4.36	4.42	4.36	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1107/1407	3.87	4.54	4.69	4.57	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1308/1399	3.69	4.12	4.26	4.23	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1120/1400	3.19	4.14	4.27	4.19	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	739/1179	3.49	3.89	3.96	3.85	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1206/1262	2.71	3.70	4.05	3.77	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1162/1259	3.16	4.00	4.29	4.06	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1212/1256	2.91	3.88	4.30	4.08	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	2.75	3.82	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	226/ 246	4.04	4.43	4.20	3.93	3.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	216/ 249	4.01	4.45	4.11	3.95	3.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	113/ 242	4.40	4.54	4.40	4.33	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	195/ 240	4.37	4.53	4.20	4.20	3.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	191/ 217	3.96	4.29	4.04	4.02	3.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0104
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 148
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	3	5	9	3.90	1162/1481	3.62	4.27	4.29	4.14	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	10	4.19	884/1481	3.71	4.12	4.23	4.18	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	6	3	7	3.52	1113/1249	3.59	4.12	4.27	4.14	3.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	3	3	5	4	3.22	1339/1424	3.67	4.05	4.21	4.06	3.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	7	8	4.05	675/1396	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	7	7	4	3.48	1130/1342	3.56	3.77	4.07	3.88	3.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	732/1459	3.97	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	784/1480	4.88	4.84	4.68	4.64	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	9	5	0	3.13	1338/1450	3.07	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	1122/1409	3.88	4.36	4.42	4.36	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	5	5	8	3.95	1310/1407	3.87	4.54	4.69	4.57	3.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	3	7	7	3.85	1120/1399	3.69	4.12	4.26	4.23	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	4	4	5	2	3	3	2.76	1347/1400	3.19	4.14	4.27	4.19	2.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	5	3	6	2	3	2.74	1106/1179	3.49	3.89	3.96	3.85	2.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1262	2.71	3.70	4.05	3.77	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1259	3.16	4.00	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1256	2.91	3.88	4.30	4.08	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 788	2.75	3.82	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	106/ 246	4.04	4.43	4.20	3.93	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	164/ 249	4.01	4.45	4.11	3.95	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	43/ 242	4.40	4.54	4.40	4.33	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	2	0	1	0	13	4.38	129/ 240	4.37	4.53	4.20	4.20	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	2	1	12	4.44	76/ 217	3.96	4.29	4.04	4.02	4.44	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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 16		
				? 0			

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0106
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 150
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	4	5	1	2.81	1471/1481	3.62	4.27	4.29	4.14	2.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	8	3	1	2.94	1436/1481	3.71	4.12	4.23	4.18	2.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	6	2	1	2.56	1231/1249	3.59	4.12	4.27	4.14	2.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	4	4	3	3.50	1275/1424	3.67	4.05	4.21	4.06	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	5	5	2	3.54	1065/1396	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	2	1	5	2	2.80	1318/1342	3.56	3.77	4.07	3.88	2.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	3	7	2	3.40	1297/1459	3.97	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	936/1480	4.88	4.84	4.68	4.64	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	4	3	2	0	2.23	1440/1450	3.07	3.87	4.09	3.97	2.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	3	2	3	4	3.13	1349/1409	3.88	4.36	4.42	4.36	3.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	4	1	4	2	5	3.19	1389/1407	3.87	4.54	4.69	4.57	3.19	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	5	6	0	2	2.67	1371/1399	3.69	4.12	4.26	4.23	2.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	7	2	3	2	0	2.00	1393/1400	3.19	4.14	4.27	4.19	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	4	4	0	1	6	3.07	1039/1179	3.49	3.89	3.96	3.85	3.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	6	0	0	0	1	1.57	1256/1262	2.71	3.70	4.05	3.77	1.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	2	1	0	1	2.14	1246/1259	3.16	4.00	4.29	4.06	2.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	0	3	1	0	2.29	1237/1256	2.91	3.88	4.30	4.08	2.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	742/ 788	2.75	3.82	4.00	3.80	2.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	185/ 246	4.04	4.43	4.20	3.93	3.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	204/ 249	4.01	4.45	4.11	3.95	3.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	222/ 242	4.40	4.54	4.40	4.33	3.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	73/ 240	4.37	4.53	4.20	4.20	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	3	0	3	1	3.29	184/ 217	3.96	4.29	4.04	4.02	3.29	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0107
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 151
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	5	5	1	3.00	1451/1481	3.62	4.27	4.29	4.14	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	5	2	3.31	1373/1481	3.71	4.12	4.23	4.18	3.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	7	3	3.50	1118/1249	3.59	4.12	4.27	4.14	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	5	7	2	0	2.79	1398/1424	3.67	4.05	4.21	4.06	2.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	7	2	3.56	1048/1396	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	6	4	0	2.87	1309/1342	3.56	3.77	4.07	3.88	2.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	8	4	3	3.56	1239/1459	3.97	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	491/1480	4.88	4.84	4.68	4.64	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	3	0	5	4	0	2.83	1394/1450	3.07	3.87	4.09	3.97	2.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	7	3	5	3.75	1251/1409	3.88	4.36	4.42	4.36	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	1337/1407	3.87	4.54	4.69	4.57	3.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1163/1399	3.69	4.12	4.26	4.23	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	5	5	3	1	2.87	1338/1400	3.19	4.14	4.27	4.19	2.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	7	2	4	3.38	956/1179	3.49	3.89	3.96	3.85	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1245/1262	2.71	3.70	4.05	3.77	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1144/1259	3.16	4.00	4.29	4.06	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1042/1256	2.91	3.88	4.30	4.08	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 788	2.75	3.82	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	194/ 246	4.04	4.43	4.20	3.93	3.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	6	3	3	3.75	179/ 249	4.01	4.45	4.11	3.95	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	175/ 242	4.40	4.54	4.40	4.33	4.17	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	181/ 240	4.37	4.53	4.20	4.20	3.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	165/ 217	3.96	4.29	4.04	4.02	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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 14		
				? 1			

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0201
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 152
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1018/1481	3.62	4.27	4.29	4.14	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	517/1481	3.71	4.12	4.23	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	893/1249	3.59	4.12	4.27	4.14	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	959/1424	3.67	4.05	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	297/1396	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	871/1342	3.56	3.77	4.07	3.88	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	460/1459	3.97	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	631/1480	4.88	4.84	4.68	4.64	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1133/1450	3.07	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	762/1409	3.88	4.36	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	1221/1407	3.87	4.54	4.69	4.57	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	625/1399	3.69	4.12	4.26	4.23	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1160/1400	3.19	4.14	4.27	4.19	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	560/1179	3.49	3.89	3.96	3.85	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1236/1262	2.71	3.70	4.05	3.77	2.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1259	3.16	4.00	4.29	4.06	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1256	2.91	3.88	4.30	4.08	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	87/ 246	4.04	4.43	4.20	3.93	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	76/ 249	4.01	4.45	4.11	3.95	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	84/ 242	4.40	4.54	4.40	4.33	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	103/ 240	4.37	4.53	4.20	4.20	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	79/ 217	3.96	4.29	4.04	4.02	4.42	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0207
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 153
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1193/1481	3.62	4.27	4.29	4.14	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	6	1	3.50	1320/1481	3.71	4.12	4.23	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	2	3.71	1066/1249	3.59	4.12	4.27	4.14	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	3	5	1	3.33	1316/1424	3.67	4.05	4.21	4.06	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	594/1396	3.96	4.05	3.98	3.89	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	7	2	3.69	1023/1342	3.56	3.77	4.07	3.88	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	0	3	6	3.77	1148/1459	3.97	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	561/1480	4.88	4.84	4.68	4.64	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	4	3	0	3.43	1258/1450	3.07	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1128/1409	3.88	4.36	4.42	4.36	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1337/1407	3.87	4.54	4.69	4.57	3.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1096/1399	3.69	4.12	4.26	4.23	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	4	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1017/1400	3.19	4.14	4.27	4.19	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	780/1179	3.49	3.89	3.96	3.85	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	931/1262	2.71	3.70	4.05	3.77	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1149/1259	3.16	4.00	4.29	4.06	3.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1084/1256	2.91	3.88	4.30	4.08	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 788	2.75	3.82	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	130/ 246	4.04	4.43	4.20	3.93	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	142/ 249	4.01	4.45	4.11	3.95	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	113/ 242	4.40	4.54	4.40	4.33	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	129/ 240	4.37	4.53	4.20	4.20	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	165/ 217	3.96	4.29	4.04	4.02	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0207
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 153
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 123 0101
 Title HUMAN GENETICS
 Instructor: GETHMANN, RICHA
 Enrollment: 111
 Questionnaires: 78

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 154
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	21	22	33	4.13	986/1481	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.14	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	7	15	28	25	3.87	1136/1481	3.87	4.12	4.23	4.18	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	7	18	22	27	3.86	1001/1249	3.86	4.12	4.27	4.14	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	16	2	5	16	21	17	3.75	1186/1424	3.75	4.05	4.21	4.06	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	11	3	20	21	16	3.39	1140/1396	3.39	4.05	3.98	3.89	3.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	6	6	14	25	16	3.58	1079/1342	3.58	3.77	4.07	3.88	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	7	13	15	21	19	3.43	1288/1459	3.43	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	1	74	4.99	141/1480	4.99	4.84	4.68	4.64	4.99	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	3	0	1	15	38	9	3.87	997/1450	3.87	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	9	28	38	4.34	957/1409	4.34	4.36	4.42	4.36	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	16	57	4.69	941/1407	4.69	4.54	4.69	4.57	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	11	31	31	4.17	901/1399	4.17	4.12	4.26	4.23	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	12	16	48	4.44	658/1400	4.44	4.14	4.27	4.19	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	33	7	7	5	9	14	3.38	952/1179	3.38	3.89	3.96	3.85	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	6	5	14	10	18	3.55	980/1262	3.55	3.70	4.05	3.77	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	2	14	12	24	4.06	881/1259	4.06	4.00	4.29	4.06	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	2	3	8	11	28	4.15	832/1256	4.15	3.88	4.30	4.08	4.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	47	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	72	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	3.95	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	74	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.20	4.20	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	76	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	76	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.18	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	77	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	77	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	77	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	77	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	77	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	77	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 123 0101
 Title HUMAN GENETICS
 Instructor: GETHMANN, RICHA
 Enrollment: 111
 Questionnaires: 78

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 154
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	18	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	52	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	38						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	13	C	23	General	5	Under-grad	76	Non-major	78
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	13	D	2						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 233 0101
 Title NUTRITION FOR HLTH PRO
 Instructor: WELCH, G.
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 155
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	21	4.59	469/1481	4.59	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	9	16	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	11	13	4.06	869/1249	4.06	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	354/1424	4.58	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	8	19	4.48	313/1396	4.48	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	24	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	135/1342	4.75	3.77	4.07	4.05	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	10	7	12	3.88	1071/1459	3.88	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	281/1480	4.97	4.84	4.68	4.68	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	7	12	8	4.04	819/1450	4.04	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	11	16	4.31	990/1409	4.31	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	12	14	4.25	828/1399	4.25	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	12	16	4.38	741/1400	4.38	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	2	0	3	1	5	3.64	850/1179	3.64	3.89	3.96	4.05	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	****/1262	****	3.70	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/1259	****	4.00	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/1256	****	3.88	4.30	4.28	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 2	C 4	General	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		Under-grad 32
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	24
			? 1		

Course-Section: BIOL 252 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 95
 Questionnaires: 71

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 156
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	6	60	4.85	196/1481	4.85	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	1	19	47	4.63	361/1481	4.63	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	2	18	47	4.62	393/1249	4.62	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	4	3	4	11	16	29	4.02	953/1424	4.02	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.02	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	5	3	16	43	4.45	346/1396	4.45	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	10	4	14	18	17	3.44	1145/1342	3.44	3.77	4.07	4.05	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	15	51	4.71	231/1459	4.71	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	68	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	2	0	1	15	41	4.58	281/1450	4.58	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	5	17	46	4.60	648/1409	4.60	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	65	4.96	250/1407	4.96	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	26	38	4.49	590/1399	4.49	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.49	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	7	58	4.78	287/1400	4.78	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	15	1	3	7	12	29	4.25	442/1179	4.25	3.89	3.96	4.05	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	437/1262	4.40	3.70	4.05	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	2	0	2	4	13	4.24	796/1259	4.24	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	50	0	0	0	5	2	14	4.43	658/1256	4.43	3.88	4.30	4.28	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	50	15	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	57/ 246	4.67	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	27/ 249	4.83	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	53	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	96/ 242	4.61	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.61	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	59/ 240	4.78	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	53	7	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	****/ 217	****	4.29	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	68	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	69	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	70	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	70	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	69	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	69	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	69	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	69	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	69	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 252 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 95
 Questionnaires: 71

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 156
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 0	B 34		
56-83	17	2.00-2.99 5	C 7	General 5	Under-grad 71 Non-major 58
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 23	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3	Other 54	

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 157
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	292/1481	4.90	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	228/1481	4.71	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	245/1249	4.66	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	695/1424	4.18	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	257/1396	4.56	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	6	3	6	3.35	1180/1342	3.52	3.77	4.07	4.05	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	196/1459	4.80	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	245/1450	4.14	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	727/1409	4.49	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.63	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	480/1399	4.44	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	480/1400	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	192/1179	4.00	3.89	3.96	4.05	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1262	4.25	3.70	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1259	4.61	4.00	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1256	4.68	3.88	4.30	4.28	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	4.60	3.82	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	57/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	21/ 249	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.87	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 242	4.66	4.54	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	69/ 240	4.64	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 217	4.56	4.29	4.04	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 1		

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 158
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	292/1481	4.90	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	228/1481	4.71	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	245/1249	4.66	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	695/1424	4.18	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	257/1396	4.56	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	6	3	6	3.35	1180/1342	3.52	3.77	4.07	4.05	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	196/1459	4.80	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1030/1450	4.14	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	483/1409	4.49	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	614/1407	4.63	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	567/1399	4.44	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	791/1400	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	104/1179	4.00	3.89	3.96	4.05	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1262	4.25	3.70	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1259	4.61	4.00	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1256	4.68	3.88	4.30	4.28	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	4.60	3.82	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	57/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	21/ 249	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.87	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 242	4.66	4.54	4.40	4.63	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	69/ 240	4.64	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 217	4.56	4.29	4.04	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 1		

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0201
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 159
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1481	4.90	4.27	4.29	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	481/1481	4.71	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	639/1249	4.66	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	818/1424	4.18	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	252/1396	4.56	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	1	5	3.54	1101/1342	3.52	3.77	4.07	4.05	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	242/1459	4.80	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	609/1450	4.14	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	1049/1409	4.49	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	1268/1407	4.63	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	753/1399	4.44	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	791/1400	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1179	4.00	3.89	3.96	4.05	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	40/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	69/ 249	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	106/ 242	4.66	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	137/ 240	4.64	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	4.56	4.29	4.04	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 15	Non-major 13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 0			

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0201
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 160
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1481	4.90	4.27	4.29	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	481/1481	4.71	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	639/1249	4.66	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	818/1424	4.18	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	252/1396	4.56	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	1	5	3.54	1101/1342	3.52	3.77	4.07	4.05	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	242/1459	4.80	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	836/1450	4.14	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	968/1409	4.49	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1268/1407	4.63	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	956/1399	4.44	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	791/1400	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1179	4.00	3.89	3.96	4.05	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	40/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	69/ 249	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	106/ 242	4.66	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	137/ 240	4.64	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	4.56	4.29	4.04	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 15 Non-major 13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0201
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 161
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1481	4.90	4.27	4.29	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	481/1481	4.71	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	639/1249	4.66	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	818/1424	4.18	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	252/1396	4.56	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	1	5	3.54	1101/1342	3.52	3.77	4.07	4.05	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	242/1459	4.80	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	836/1450	4.14	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	968/1409	4.49	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1221/1407	4.63	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	753/1399	4.44	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	890/1400	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1179	4.00	3.89	3.96	4.05	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	40/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	69/ 249	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	106/ 242	4.66	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	137/ 240	4.64	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	4.56	4.29	4.04	4.28	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 15	Non-major 13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 0			

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0301
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 162
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1481	4.90	4.27	4.29	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	69/1481	4.71	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	172/1249	4.66	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	7	6	3.95	1023/1424	4.18	4.05	4.21	4.28	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	233/1396	4.56	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	4	7	3.65	1044/1342	3.52	3.77	4.07	4.05	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	101/1459	4.80	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	2	16	4.68	203/1450	4.14	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	113/1409	4.49	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1407	4.63	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	145/1399	4.44	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	166/1400	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	753/1179	4.00	3.89	3.96	4.05	3.99	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	264/1262	4.25	3.70	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	402/1259	4.61	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256	4.68	3.88	4.30	4.28	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	152/ 788	4.60	3.82	4.00	3.98	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	16/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.94	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	19/ 249	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	113/ 242	4.66	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	51/ 240	4.64	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	11	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	81/ 217	4.56	4.29	4.04	4.28	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0301
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 163
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1481	4.90	4.27	4.29	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	69/1481	4.71	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	172/1249	4.66	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	7	6	3.95	1023/1424	4.18	4.05	4.21	4.28	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	233/1396	4.56	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	5	4	7	3.65	1044/1342	3.52	3.77	4.07	4.05	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	101/1459	4.80	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	4	7	0	3.31	1294/1450	4.14	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	968/1409	4.49	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1153/1407	4.63	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	956/1399	4.44	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	977/1400	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	510/1179	4.00	3.89	3.96	4.05	3.99	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	264/1262	4.25	3.70	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	402/1259	4.61	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256	4.68	3.88	4.30	4.28	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	152/ 788	4.60	3.82	4.00	3.98	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	16/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.94	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	19/ 249	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	113/ 242	4.66	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	51/ 240	4.64	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	11	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	81/ 217	4.56	4.29	4.04	4.28	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0401
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 164
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	256/1481	4.90	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	299/1481	4.71	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	219/1249	4.66	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	717/1424	4.18	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	321/1396	4.56	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	3	6	4	3.53	1106/1342	3.52	3.77	4.07	4.05	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	107/1459	4.80	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	588/1450	4.14	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	693/1409	4.49	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	568/1407	4.63	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	431/1399	4.44	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	397/1400	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	956/1179	4.00	3.89	3.96	4.05	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	842/1262	4.25	3.70	4.05	4.11	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	588/1259	4.61	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	571/1256	4.68	3.88	4.30	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 788	4.60	3.82	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	33/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.81	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	31/ 249	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.81	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	94/ 242	4.66	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	51/ 240	4.64	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	9	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	42/ 217	4.56	4.29	4.04	4.28	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0401
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 165
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	256/1481	4.90	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	299/1481	4.71	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	219/1249	4.66	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	717/1424	4.18	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	321/1396	4.56	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	3	6	4	3.53	1106/1342	3.52	3.77	4.07	4.05	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	107/1459	4.80	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	672/1450	4.14	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	878/1409	4.49	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	659/1407	4.63	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	567/1399	4.44	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	421/1400	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	6	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1011/1179	4.00	3.89	3.96	4.05	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	842/1262	4.25	3.70	4.05	4.11	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	588/1259	4.61	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	571/1256	4.68	3.88	4.30	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 788	4.60	3.82	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	33/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.81	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	31/ 249	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.81	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	94/ 242	4.66	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	51/ 240	4.64	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	9	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	42/ 217	4.56	4.29	4.04	4.28	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	6	11	24	44	4.17	938/1481	4.17	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	11	17	36	20	3.68	1248/1481	3.68	4.12	4.23	4.29	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	10	18	36	21	3.77	1041/1249	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.36	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	69	0	1	7	3	6	3.82	****/1424	****	4.05	4.21	4.28	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	9	5	2	11	26	31	4.01	700/1396	4.01	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.01	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	72	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	****/1342	****	3.77	4.07	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	3	3	21	29	28	3.90	1048/1459	3.90	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	1	82	4.99	141/1480	4.99	4.84	4.68	4.68	4.99	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	2	24	31	20	3.86	1014/1450	3.78	3.87	4.09	4.15	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	8	20	55	4.47	813/1409	4.48	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	1	4	13	67	4.63	997/1407	4.67	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	5	23	29	26	3.81	1140/1399	3.93	4.12	4.26	4.29	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	5	12	24	42	4.16	937/1400	4.19	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	1	5	7	21	37	4.24	457/1179	4.24	3.89	3.96	4.05	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	74	0	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	****/1262	****	3.70	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	74	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	****/1259	****	4.00	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	75	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	****/1256	****	3.88	4.30	4.28	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	76	10	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	86	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	86	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	86	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	86	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	86	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 217	****	4.29	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 275 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 178
 Questionnaires: 89

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 166
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	1	B	31						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	11	C	21	General	4	Under-grad	89	Non-major	67
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	17	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	24	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	67				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	6	11	24	44	4.17	938/1481	4.17	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	11	17	36	20	3.68	1248/1481	3.68	4.12	4.23	4.29	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	10	18	36	21	3.77	1041/1249	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.36	3.77		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	69	0	1	7	3	6	3.82	****/1424	****	4.05	4.21	4.28	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	9	5	2	11	26	31	4.01	700/1396	4.01	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.01	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	72	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	****/1342	****	3.77	4.07	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	3	3	21	29	28	3.90	1048/1459	3.90	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	1	82	4.99	141/1480	4.99	4.84	4.68	4.68	4.99	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	1	29	37	9	3.71	1133/1450	3.78	3.87	4.09	4.15	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	2	5	25	48	4.49	787/1409	4.48	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	2	16	61	4.71	899/1407	4.67	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	7	11	30	31	4.04	991/1399	3.93	4.12	4.26	4.29	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	12	25	38	4.22	898/1400	4.19	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	8	1	4	8	20	36	4.25	449/1179	4.24	3.89	3.96	4.05	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	74	0	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	****/1262	****	3.70	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	74	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	****/1259	****	4.00	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	75	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	****/1256	****	3.88	4.30	4.28	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	76	10	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	86	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	86	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	86	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	86	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	86	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 217	****	4.29	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 275 0101

Title MICROBIOLOGY

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 178

Questionnaires: 89

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 167

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	1	B	31						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	11	C	21	General	4	Under-grad	89	Non-major	67
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	17	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	24	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	67				
				?	4						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 168
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	729/1481	4.52	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	917/1481	4.24	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	703/1249	4.38	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	784/1424	4.38	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	869/1396	4.16	4.05	3.98	3.94	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	755/1342	4.11	3.77	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	7	5	7	3.85	1086/1459	3.93	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	4.82	4.84	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	931/1450	4.12	3.87	4.09	4.15	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	990/1409	4.54	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	1168/1407	4.73	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	9	6	3.95	1049/1399	4.15	4.12	4.26	4.29	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	5	6	7	4.00	1017/1400	4.29	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	8	2	5	3.63	853/1179	3.96	3.89	3.96	4.05	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1018/1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	4.11	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	548/1259	4.35	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	901/1256	3.99	3.88	4.30	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	74/ 246	4.59	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	122/ 249	4.46	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	170/ 242	4.55	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.21	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	103/ 240	4.57	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	149/ 217	4.27	4.29	4.04	4.28	3.79	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	21	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0201
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 169
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	549/1481	4.52	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	758/1481	4.24	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	655/1249	4.38	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	473/1424	4.38	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	1	10	5	4.00	707/1396	4.16	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	11	6	4.10	695/1342	4.11	3.77	4.07	4.05	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	10	6	5	3.68	1192/1459	3.93	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	351/1480	4.82	4.84	4.68	4.68	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	11	4	4.00	836/1450	4.12	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	9	12	4.50	762/1409	4.54	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	591/1407	4.73	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	12	6	4.05	987/1399	4.15	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	816/1400	4.29	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	4	3	5	6	3.72	813/1179	3.96	3.89	3.96	4.05	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	887/1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	4.11	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	701/1259	4.35	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	496/1256	3.99	3.88	4.30	4.28	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	127/ 246	4.59	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.28	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	69/ 249	4.46	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	96/ 242	4.55	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.61	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	89/ 240	4.57	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.61	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	103/ 217	4.27	4.29	4.04	4.28	4.28	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0201
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 169
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0301
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 170
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	531/1481	4.52	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	843/1481	4.24	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	393/1249	4.38	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	287/1424	4.38	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	451/1396	4.16	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	527/1342	4.11	3.77	4.07	4.05	4.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	10	6	3.95	1004/1459	3.93	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	6	4.30	1178/1480	4.82	4.84	4.68	4.68	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	712/1450	4.12	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	400/1409	4.54	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	804/1407	4.73	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	783/1399	4.15	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	11	9	4.33	791/1400	4.29	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	590/1179	3.96	3.89	3.96	4.05	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	931/1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	4.11	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	895/1259	4.35	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	901/1256	3.99	3.88	4.30	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	53/ 246	4.59	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	99/ 249	4.46	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.41	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	63/ 242	4.55	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	76/ 240	4.57	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	58/ 217	4.27	4.29	4.04	4.28	4.59	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0401
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 171
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	13	4.38	698/1481	4.52	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	682/1481	4.24	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	4	15	4.48	535/1249	4.38	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	6	11	4.25	740/1424	4.38	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	3	12	4.15	594/1396	4.16	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	8	8	4.10	695/1342	4.11	3.77	4.07	4.05	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	6	9	4.10	914/1459	3.93	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1480	4.82	4.84	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	5	8	4.11	781/1450	4.12	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	762/1409	4.54	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	614/1407	4.73	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	683/1399	4.15	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	5	12	4.35	766/1400	4.29	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	518/1179	3.96	3.89	3.96	4.05	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	949/1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	4.11	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	895/1259	4.35	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1106/1256	3.99	3.88	4.30	4.28	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	49/ 246	4.59	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.72	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	105/ 249	4.46	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.39	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	84/ 242	4.55	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	1	1	1	14	4.44	115/ 240	4.57	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.44	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	55/ 217	4.27	4.29	4.04	4.28	4.61	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0401
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 171
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0501
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 172
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	188/1481	4.52	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	934/1481	4.24	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	832/1249	4.38	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	684/1424	4.38	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	274/1396	4.16	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	713/1342	4.11	3.77	4.07	4.05	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	929/1459	3.93	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	756/1480	4.82	4.84	4.68	4.68	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	473/1450	4.12	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	648/1409	4.54	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	861/1407	4.73	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	2	7	4.07	980/1399	4.15	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	636/1400	4.29	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	419/1179	3.96	3.89	3.96	4.05	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	437/1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.35	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1025/1256	3.99	3.88	4.30	4.28	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	44/ 246	4.59	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	53/ 249	4.46	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	113/ 242	4.55	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	93/ 240	4.57	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.58	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	126/ 217	4.27	4.29	4.04	4.28	4.09	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 1	Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 12
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 14
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	2	4	15	34	41	4.13	986/1481	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	7	22	31	36	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	3	4	21	30	38	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	47	2	4	14	14	15	3.73	1197/1424	3.73	4.05	4.21	4.27	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	10	9	27	25	21	3.41	1130/1396	3.41	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	42	10	5	13	10	14	3.25	1207/1342	3.25	3.77	4.07	4.12	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	3	16	29	45	4.21	809/1459	4.21	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	2	91	4.98	211/1480	4.98	4.84	4.68	4.65	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	2	15	35	31	4.14	741/1450	3.90	3.87	4.09	4.10	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	6	18	68	4.65	588/1409	4.57	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	12	81	4.87	568/1407	4.83	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	4	13	30	44	4.22	864/1399	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	4	6	20	61	4.44	658/1400	4.40	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	6	6	2	3	16	59	4.40	346/1179	4.13	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	77	0	5	0	4	8	6	3.43	****/1262	****	3.70	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	77	0	3	0	4	5	11	3.91	****/1259	****	4.00	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	77	0	2	0	3	3	15	4.26	****/1256	****	3.88	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	77	5	3	0	4	6	5	3.56	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	97	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	97	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	97	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	97	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	97	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.29	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	98	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	98	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	98	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 258
 Questionnaires: 100

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 173
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 3	A 32	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 46
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 37		
56-83	19	2.00-2.99 7	C 12	General 7	Under-grad 100 Non-major 54
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 18	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 27	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 61	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	2	4	15	34	41	4.13	986/1481	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	7	22	31	36	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	3	4	21	30	38	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	47	2	4	14	14	15	3.73	1197/1424	3.73	4.05	4.21	4.27	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	10	9	27	25	21	3.41	1130/1396	3.41	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	42	10	5	13	10	14	3.25	1207/1342	3.25	3.77	4.07	4.12	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	3	16	29	45	4.21	809/1459	4.21	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	2	91	4.98	211/1480	4.98	4.84	4.68	4.65	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	0	2	3	20	37	9	3.68	1156/1450	3.90	3.87	4.09	4.10	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	2	7	19	43	4.45	826/1409	4.57	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	0	1	11	58	4.81	705/1407	4.83	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	6	9	20	35	4.20	883/1399	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	4	6	18	42	4.40	704/1400	4.40	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	6	6	4	15	11	26	3.76	793/1179	4.13	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	77	0	5	0	4	8	6	3.43	****/1262	****	3.70	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	77	0	3	0	4	5	11	3.91	****/1259	****	4.00	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	77	0	2	0	3	3	15	4.26	****/1256	****	3.88	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	77	5	3	0	4	6	5	3.56	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	97	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	97	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	97	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	97	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	97	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.29	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	98	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	98	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	98	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 258
 Questionnaires: 100

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 174
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3	A	32	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	46
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	37						
56-83	19	2.00-2.99	7	C	12	General	7	Under-grad	100	Non-major	54
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	27	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	61				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	2	4	15	34	41	4.13	986/1481	4.13	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	7	22	31	36	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	3	4	21	30	38	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	47	2	4	14	14	15	3.73	1197/1424	3.73	4.05	4.21	4.27	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	10	9	27	25	21	3.41	1130/1396	3.41	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	42	10	5	13	10	14	3.25	1207/1342	3.25	3.77	4.07	4.12	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	3	16	29	45	4.21	809/1459	4.21	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	2	91	4.98	211/1480	4.98	4.84	4.68	4.65	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	1	1	1	15	43	11	3.87	997/1450	3.90	3.87	4.09	4.10	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	0	4	19	48	4.62	633/1409	4.57	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	30	0	0	0	1	12	57	4.80	728/1407	4.83	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	30	0	0	1	11	24	34	4.30	783/1399	4.24	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	3	8	19	40	4.37	741/1400	4.40	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	5	2	3	7	17	34	4.24	457/1179	4.13	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	77	0	5	0	4	8	6	3.43	****/1262	****	3.70	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	77	0	3	0	4	5	11	3.91	****/1259	****	4.00	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	77	0	2	0	3	3	15	4.26	****/1256	****	3.88	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	77	5	3	0	4	6	5	3.56	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	97	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	97	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	97	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	97	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	97	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.29	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	98	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	98	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	98	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 258
 Questionnaires: 100

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 175
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3	A	32	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	46
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	37						
56-83	19	2.00-2.99	7	C	12	General	7	Under-grad	100	Non-major	54
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	27	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	61				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	9	7	14	15	11	3.21	1425/1481	3.21	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	9	13	17	9	7	2.85	1448/1481	2.85	4.12	4.23	4.23	2.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	6	9	13	18	9	3.27	1159/1249	3.27	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	43	5	3	2	1	1	2.17	****/1424	****	4.05	4.21	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	3	5	4	10	11	20	3.74	926/1396	3.74	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	42	4	3	1	2	0	2.10	****/1342	****	3.77	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	6	7	17	11	12	3.30	1327/1459	3.30	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	4	26	23	2	3.42	1460/1480	3.42	4.84	4.68	4.65	3.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	11	7	17	8	1	2.57	1424/1450	2.94	3.87	4.09	4.10	2.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	13	7	16	8	10	2.91	1377/1409	3.35	4.36	4.42	4.43	3.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	11	3	12	15	13	3.30	1384/1407	3.57	4.54	4.69	4.67	3.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	19	9	14	8	3	2.38	1390/1399	2.66	4.12	4.26	4.27	2.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	2	19	8	11	8	6	2.50	1364/1400	2.85	4.14	4.27	4.28	2.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	14	18	7	6	4	4	2.21	1150/1179	2.80	3.89	3.96	4.02	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	41	0	7	3	2	5	1	2.44	1229/1262	2.44	3.70	4.05	4.14	2.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	41	0	6	2	4	2	4	2.78	1205/1259	2.78	4.00	4.29	4.34	2.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41	0	7	2	3	2	4	2.67	1212/1256	2.67	3.88	4.30	4.34	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	40	13	3	0	2	1	0	2.17	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.29	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302 0101
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI
 Instructor: BRADLEY, BRIAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 276
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 176
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	11
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	56	Non-major	48
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	43				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302 0101
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 276
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 177
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	9	7	14	15	11	3.21	1425/1481	3.21	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	9	13	17	9	7	2.85	1448/1481	2.85	4.12	4.23	4.23	2.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	6	9	13	18	9	3.27	1159/1249	3.27	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	43	5	3	2	1	1	2.17	****/1424	****	4.05	4.21	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	3	5	4	10	11	20	3.74	926/1396	3.74	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	42	4	3	1	2	0	2.10	****/1342	****	3.77	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	6	7	17	11	12	3.30	1327/1459	3.30	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	4	26	23	2	3.42	1460/1480	3.42	4.84	4.68	4.65	3.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	2	7	13	14	5	3.32	1291/1450	2.94	3.87	4.09	4.10	2.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	4	1	12	14	16	3.79	1243/1409	3.35	4.36	4.42	4.43	3.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	3	2	8	20	14	3.85	1331/1407	3.57	4.54	4.69	4.67	3.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	8	7	15	12	4	2.93	1341/1399	2.66	4.12	4.26	4.27	2.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	2	5	11	8	12	9	3.20	1291/1400	2.85	4.14	4.27	4.28	2.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	4	8	10	12	11	3.40	945/1179	2.80	3.89	3.96	4.02	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	41	0	7	3	2	5	1	2.44	1229/1262	2.44	3.70	4.05	4.14	2.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	41	0	6	2	4	2	4	2.78	1205/1259	2.78	4.00	4.29	4.34	2.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41	0	7	2	3	2	4	2.67	1212/1256	2.67	3.88	4.30	4.34	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	40	13	3	0	2	1	0	2.17	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.29	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302 0101
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 276
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 177
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	11
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	56	Non-major	48
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	43				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 178
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	729/1481	4.24	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	517/1481	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	0	6	6	4.00	893/1249	4.16	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	717/1424	4.20	4.05	4.21	4.27	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1036/1396	3.78	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	980/1342	4.02	3.77	4.07	4.12	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	635/1459	4.16	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	561/1480	4.93	4.84	4.68	4.65	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	296/1450	4.35	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	514/1409	4.67	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	636/1407	4.77	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	256/1399	4.52	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	561/1400	4.56	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	2	0	3	0	3	3.25	997/1179	3.93	3.89	3.96	4.02	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	507/1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	836/1259	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	901/1256	3.91	3.88	4.30	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 788	2.67	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	89/ 246	4.34	4.43	4.20	4.20	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	114/ 249	4.55	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	106/ 242	4.51	4.54	4.40	4.36	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	115/ 240	4.48	4.53	4.20	3.96	4.44	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	110/ 217	4.58	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.22	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0202
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 179
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	928/1481	4.24	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	736/1481	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	854/1249	4.16	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	908/1424	4.20	4.05	4.21	4.27	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	801/1396	3.78	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	592/1342	4.02	3.77	4.07	4.12	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1048/1459	4.16	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.84	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	722/1450	4.35	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	545/1407	4.77	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	567/1399	4.52	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	492/1400	4.56	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	340/1179	3.93	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1108/1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	4.14	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1067/1259	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.34	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1084/1256	3.91	3.88	4.30	4.34	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	749/ 788	2.67	3.82	4.00	4.07	2.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	106/ 246	4.34	4.43	4.20	4.20	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	23/ 249	4.55	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	71/ 242	4.51	4.54	4.40	4.36	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	119/ 240	4.48	4.53	4.20	3.96	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	27/ 217	4.58	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0202
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 180
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	928/1481	4.24	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	736/1481	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	854/1249	4.16	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	908/1424	4.20	4.05	4.21	4.27	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	801/1396	3.78	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	592/1342	4.02	3.77	4.07	4.12	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1048/1459	4.16	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.84	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	281/1450	4.35	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	865/1409	4.67	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	823/1407	4.77	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	567/1399	4.52	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	468/1400	4.56	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	384/1179	3.93	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1108/1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	4.14	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1067/1259	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.34	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1084/1256	3.91	3.88	4.30	4.34	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	749/ 788	2.67	3.82	4.00	4.07	2.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	106/ 246	4.34	4.43	4.20	4.20	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	23/ 249	4.55	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	71/ 242	4.51	4.54	4.40	4.36	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	119/ 240	4.48	4.53	4.20	3.96	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	27/ 217	4.58	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0301
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 181
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	870/1481	4.24	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	646/1481	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	611/1249	4.16	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	896/1424	4.20	4.05	4.21	4.27	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	6	4	4	3.67	985/1396	3.78	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	755/1342	4.02	3.77	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	5	7	3.94	1013/1459	4.16	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	825/1480	4.93	4.84	4.68	4.65	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	459/1450	4.35	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	739/1409	4.67	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	1091/1407	4.77	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	733/1399	4.52	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	444/1400	4.56	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	6	3	6	3.88	712/1179	3.93	3.89	3.96	4.02	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1259	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1256	3.91	3.88	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 788	2.67	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	138/ 246	4.34	4.43	4.20	4.20	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	72/ 249	4.55	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.53	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	172/ 242	4.51	4.54	4.40	4.36	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	124/ 240	4.48	4.53	4.20	3.96	4.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	94/ 217	4.58	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0301
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 181
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	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	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0302
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 182
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	1069/1481	4.24	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	909/1481	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	765/1249	4.16	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	840/1424	4.20	4.05	4.21	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	8	3	4	3.47	1098/1396	3.78	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	626/1342	4.02	3.77	4.07	4.12	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	11	4.28	757/1459	4.16	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	729/1480	4.93	4.84	4.68	4.65	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	702/1450	4.35	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	383/1409	4.67	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	963/1407	4.77	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	513/1399	4.52	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	658/1400	4.56	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	739/1179	3.93	3.89	3.96	4.02	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	418/1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	4.14	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	402/1259	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1256	3.91	3.88	4.30	4.34	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 788	2.67	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	109/ 246	4.34	4.43	4.20	4.20	4.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	31/ 249	4.55	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.82	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	107/ 242	4.51	4.54	4.40	4.36	4.55	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	71/ 240	4.48	4.53	4.20	3.96	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	41/ 217	4.58	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 2		

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0401
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 183
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	496/1481	4.24	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	693/1481	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	695/1249	4.16	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	521/1424	4.20	4.05	4.21	4.27	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	536/1396	3.78	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	4	6	3.93	845/1342	4.02	3.77	4.07	4.12	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	520/1459	4.16	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	743/1480	4.93	4.84	4.68	4.65	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	445/1450	4.35	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	231/1409	4.67	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	350/1407	4.77	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	376/1399	4.52	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	468/1400	4.56	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	331/1179	3.93	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	887/1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	4.14	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	895/1259	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	0	0	1	5	3.88	996/1256	3.91	3.88	4.30	4.34	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	2.67	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	104/ 246	4.34	4.43	4.20	4.20	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	86/ 249	4.55	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.46	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	96/ 242	4.51	4.54	4.40	4.36	4.62	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	62/ 240	4.48	4.53	4.20	3.96	4.77	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	51/ 217	4.58	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.64	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0501
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 184
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	938/1481	4.24	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	843/1481	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	945/1249	4.16	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	829/1424	4.20	4.05	4.21	4.27	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	2	5	4	3.69	965/1396	3.78	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	898/1342	4.02	3.77	4.07	4.12	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	2	10	4.24	792/1459	4.16	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.84	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	741/1450	4.35	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	529/1409	4.67	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	823/1407	4.77	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	773/1399	4.52	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	636/1400	4.56	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	945/1179	3.93	3.89	3.96	4.02	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	829/1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	4.14	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1012/1259	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.34	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1012/1256	3.91	3.88	4.30	4.34	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	2.67	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	130/ 246	4.34	4.43	4.20	4.20	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	145/ 249	4.55	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	168/ 242	4.51	4.54	4.40	4.36	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	153/ 240	4.48	4.53	4.20	3.96	4.18	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	79/ 217	4.58	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.42	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, DAPHN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 270
 Questionnaires: 99

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 185
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	15	27	53	4.29	792/1481	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	8	22	32	36	3.95	1070/1481	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.23	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	13	23	31	30	3.78	1036/1249	3.78	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	75	3	1	6	5	9	3.67	****/1424	****	4.05	4.21	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	8	10	20	28	31	3.66	992/1396	3.66	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.66	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	87	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	****/1342	****	3.77	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	6	7	21	20	42	3.89	1063/1459	3.89	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	1	0	0	0	94	4.96	351/1480	4.96	4.84	4.68	4.65	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	3	5	31	33	12	3.55	1209/1450	3.58	3.87	4.09	4.10	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	3	21	71	4.59	670/1409	4.55	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	3	12	81	4.74	842/1407	4.60	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	3	13	41	36	4.05	984/1399	4.00	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	13	31	47	4.14	953/1400	4.09	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	4	1	4	24	64	4.47	283/1179	4.10	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	74	0	8	1	7	5	4	2.84	1184/1262	2.84	3.70	4.05	4.14	2.84	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	73	0	7	2	6	5	6	3.04	1160/1259	3.04	4.00	4.29	4.34	3.04	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	74	0	7	2	5	7	4	2.96	1177/1256	2.96	3.88	4.30	4.34	2.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	74	21	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	98	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	98	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	4.23	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	97	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	97	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	97	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	98	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	98	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	98	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	98	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	98	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	98	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	39	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	52
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	30						
56-83	27	2.00-2.99	11	C	16	General	0	Under-grad	98	Non-major	47
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	22	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	28	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	92				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	15	27	53	4.29	792/1481	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	8	22	32	36	3.95	1070/1481	3.95	4.12	4.23	4.23	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	13	23	31	30	3.78	1036/1249	3.78	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	75	3	1	6	5	9	3.67	****/1424	****	4.05	4.21	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	8	10	20	28	31	3.66	992/1396	3.66	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.66	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	87	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	****/1342	****	3.77	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	6	7	21	20	42	3.89	1063/1459	3.89	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	1	0	0	0	94	4.96	351/1480	4.96	4.84	4.68	4.65	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	3	4	22	42	8	3.61	1189/1450	3.58	3.87	4.09	4.10	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	4	4	19	60	4.51	750/1409	4.55	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	4	0	7	18	58	4.45	1153/1407	4.60	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	4	7	12	29	34	3.95	1049/1399	4.00	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	4	5	15	22	41	4.05	1004/1400	4.09	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	10	6	8	18	18	30	3.72	813/1179	4.10	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	74	0	8	1	7	5	4	2.84	1184/1262	2.84	3.70	4.05	4.14	2.84	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	73	0	7	2	6	5	6	3.04	1160/1259	3.04	4.00	4.29	4.34	3.04	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	74	0	7	2	5	7	4	2.96	1177/1256	2.96	3.88	4.30	4.34	2.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	74	21	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	98	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	98	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	4.23	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	97	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	97	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	97	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	98	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	98	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	98	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	98	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	98	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	98	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Frequency Distribution					Reasons	Type	Majors		
		Expected Grades									
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	39	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	52
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	30						
56-83	27	2.00-2.99	11	C	16	General	0	Under-grad	98	Non-major	47
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	22	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	28	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	92				
				?	5						

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 0201
 Title CELL BIOLOGY LAB
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 70

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 187
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	12	21	34	4.26	831/1481	4.26	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	19	43	4.55	458/1481	4.55	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	6	17	42	4.46	548/1249	4.46	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	5	5	26	30	4.18	829/1424	4.18	4.05	4.21	4.27	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	1	3	10	20	26	4.12	633/1396	4.12	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	1	11	20	29	4.02	749/1342	4.02	3.77	4.07	4.12	4.02	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	6	11	45	4.45	535/1459	4.45	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	0	3	61	4.91	702/1480	4.91	4.84	4.68	4.65	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	4	24	31	4.42	459/1450	4.42	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	2	10	45	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	1	5	13	38	4.54	1076/1407	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	4	14	39	4.61	445/1399	4.61	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	5	16	33	4.31	816/1400	4.31	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	20	2	2	7	11	11	3.82	753/1179	3.82	3.89	3.96	4.02	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	1	4	10	13	4.25	570/1262	4.25	3.70	4.05	4.14	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	1	0	4	9	14	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	1	1	4	9	13	4.14	837/1256	4.14	3.88	4.30	4.34	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	42	10	5	1	0	5	7	3.44	631/ 788	3.44	3.82	4.00	4.07	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	2	3	7	25	4.49	79/ 246	4.49	4.43	4.20	4.20	4.49	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	0	2	5	29	4.75	40/ 249	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	1	8	28	4.73	69/ 242	4.73	4.54	4.40	4.36	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	3	5	29	4.70	76/ 240	4.70	4.53	4.20	3.96	4.70	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	2	3	4	8	20	4.11	126/ 217	4.11	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.11	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	20	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	40
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	70	Non-major	30
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	12	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						
				?	2						
						Other	51				

Course-Section: BIOL 305 0101
 Title COMP. ANIMAL PHYSIOLOG
 Instructor: VIANCOUR, TERRY
 Enrollment: 202
 Questionnaires: 116

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 188
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	10	25	77	4.58	487/1481	4.58	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	4	17	36	56	4.27	801/1481	4.27	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	8	14	33	57	4.21	773/1249	4.21	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	86	1	1	7	7	11	3.96	****/1424	****	4.05	4.21	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	7	10	12	26	27	31	3.54	1065/1396	3.54	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	82	1	5	5	7	13	3.84	934/1342	3.84	3.77	4.07	4.12	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	6	5	25	28	48	3.96	1004/1459	3.96	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	0	0	111	4.97	211/1480	4.97	4.84	4.68	4.65	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	3	3	3	12	47	31	4.04	814/1450	4.04	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	27	81	4.70	500/1409	4.70	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	18	90	4.77	785/1407	4.77	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	6	9	46	50	4.26	819/1399	4.26	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	14	22	74	4.55	551/1400	4.55	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	0	1	9	25	68	4.55	233/1179	4.55	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	85	0	0	2	4	14	11	4.10	677/1262	4.10	3.70	4.05	4.14	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	85	0	0	1	1	10	19	4.52	580/1259	4.52	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	86	0	1	2	3	10	14	4.13	843/1256	4.13	3.88	4.30	4.34	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	85	18	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	115	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	115	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	115	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	115	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	115	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.29	4.04	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	26	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	88
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	33						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	14	C	24	General	0	Under-grad	115	Non-major	28
84-150	49	3.00-3.49	21	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	27	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	92				
				?	12						

Course-Section: BIOL 305L 0101
 Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 93
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 189
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	6	9	43	4.59	469/1481	4.59	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	12	43	4.64	349/1481	4.64	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	10	45	4.68	322/1249	4.68	4.12	4.27	4.28	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	0	4	18	35	4.42	533/1424	4.42	4.05	4.21	4.27	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	2	1	8	12	23	4.15	594/1396	4.15	4.05	3.98	4.00	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	7	19	28	4.21	581/1342	4.21	3.77	4.07	4.12	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	1	3	13	39	4.61	344/1459	4.61	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	59	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	2	0	3	20	19	4.23	662/1450	4.23	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	3	3	48	4.78	367/1409	4.78	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	5	49	4.87	568/1407	4.87	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	2	10	41	4.69	349/1399	4.69	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	6	10	39	4.60	492/1400	4.60	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	0	10	7	30	4.43	323/1179	4.43	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	335/1262	4.52	3.70	4.05	4.14	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	1	1	1	5	13	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	1	0	4	5	9	4.11	860/1256	4.11	3.88	4.30	4.34	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	43	11	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	2	5	26	4.73	49/ 246	4.73	4.43	4.20	4.20	4.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	7	26	4.79	35/ 249	4.79	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.79	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	47/ 242	4.85	4.54	4.40	4.36	4.85	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	51/ 240	4.82	4.53	4.20	3.96	4.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	2	6	25	4.70	45/ 217	4.70	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.70	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	56
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	18						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	9	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	61	Non-major	5
84-150	39	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	53				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 397 0101
 Title ETHICS/INTEG SCIENT RE
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, SUZA
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 190
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	4	7	6	12	3.80	1225/1481	3.80	4.27	4.29	4.29	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	9	4	10	3.35	1369/1481	3.35	4.12	4.23	4.23	3.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	1	0	5	0	4	3.60	1096/1249	3.60	4.12	4.27	4.28	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	4	2	6	8	7	3.44	1288/1424	3.44	4.05	4.21	4.27	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	6	8	4	7	3.14	1255/1396	3.14	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	2	6	8	7	3.28	1202/1342	3.28	3.77	4.07	4.12	3.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	9	4	1	1	3	11	3.80	1125/1459	3.80	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	6	1	3	10	6	1	3.14	1333/1450	3.14	3.87	4.09	4.10	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	3	13	10	4.15	1098/1409	4.15	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	0	6	8	11	3.96	1307/1407	3.96	4.54	4.69	4.67	3.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	1	5	7	11	3.81	1140/1399	3.81	4.12	4.26	4.27	3.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	6	5	5	9	3.48	1235/1400	3.48	4.14	4.27	4.28	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	5	0	8	7	5	3.28	989/1179	3.28	3.89	3.96	4.02	3.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	596/1262	4.21	3.70	4.05	4.14	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	532/1259	4.57	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	658/1256	4.43	3.88	4.30	4.34	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	9	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.07	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	31	Non-major	22
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	25						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 397W 0101
 Title SCIENTIFIC WRITING
 Instructor: PORTER, JANE P.
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 191
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.27	4.29	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.12	4.23	4.23	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.05	4.21	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.05	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	3.77	4.07	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.65	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.36	4.42	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.12	4.26	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.14	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.89	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	3.70	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.00	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	3.88	4.30	4.34	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 414 0101
 Title EUKARYOTICS GEN/MOL BI
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, PHIL
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 192
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	3	8	8	3.87	1187/1481	3.87	4.27	4.29	4.45	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	2	8	8	3.70	1237/1481	3.70	4.12	4.23	4.32	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	9	9	9	4.17	802/1249	4.17	4.12	4.27	4.44	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	8	8	3.96	1023/1424	3.96	4.05	4.21	4.35	3.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	7	10	3.91	791/1396	3.91	4.05	3.98	4.09	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	9	7	3.78	968/1342	3.78	3.77	4.07	4.21	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	7	11	4.17	845/1459	4.17	4.09	4.16	4.25	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	2	8	5	3.88	989/1450	3.88	3.87	4.09	4.28	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	0	2	8	10	3.96	1185/1409	3.96	4.36	4.42	4.51	3.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	4	15	4.39	1189/1407	4.39	4.54	4.69	4.79	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	2	4	4	9	3.52	1233/1399	3.52	4.12	4.26	4.36	3.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	5	4	10	3.74	1155/1400	3.74	4.14	4.27	4.38	3.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	3	2	7	7	3.67	840/1179	3.67	3.89	3.96	4.07	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	3	9	2	3.53	987/1262	3.53	3.70	4.05	4.33	3.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	715/1259	4.35	4.00	4.29	4.57	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	820/1256	4.18	3.88	4.30	4.60	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	3	1	6	6	3.94	459/ 788	3.94	3.82	4.00	4.26	3.94	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	6	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 420A 0101
 Title
 Instructor: KLOETZEL, JOHN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 193
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	957/1481	4.15	4.27	4.29	4.45	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	971/1481	4.07	4.12	4.23	4.32	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	865/1249	4.07	4.12	4.27	4.44	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	784/1424	4.21	4.05	4.21	4.35	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	536/1396	4.21	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	858/1342	3.93	3.77	4.07	4.21	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	2	4	1	3	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.09	4.16	4.25	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1288/1480	4.15	4.84	4.68	4.74	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	494/1450	4.38	3.87	4.09	4.28	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	727/1409	4.54	4.36	4.42	4.51	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.12	4.26	4.36	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	561/1400	4.54	4.14	4.27	4.38	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	732/1179	3.85	3.89	3.96	4.07	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1262	****	3.70	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1259	****	4.00	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1256	****	3.88	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 420B 0101
 Title
 Instructor: MCGRAW, PATRICI
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 194
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.27	4.29	4.45	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	4	3.86	1148/1481	3.86	4.12	4.23	4.32	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	824/1249	4.14	4.12	4.27	4.44	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.05	4.21	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	649/1342	4.14	3.77	4.07	4.21	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1247/1459	3.54	4.09	4.16	4.25	3.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	3	5	4	1	3.07	1466/1480	3.07	4.84	4.68	4.74	3.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	3.87	4.09	4.28	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1265/1409	3.69	4.36	4.42	4.51	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.54	4.69	4.79	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	1223/1399	3.57	4.12	4.26	4.36	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1211/1400	3.57	4.14	4.27	4.38	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	3	2	2	4	3.64	850/1179	3.64	3.89	3.96	4.07	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	816/1262	3.88	3.70	4.05	4.33	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.00	4.29	4.57	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	698/1256	4.38	3.88	4.30	4.60	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	548/ 788	3.71	3.82	4.00	4.26	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 428 0101
 Title COMPUTER APPL MOLEC BI
 Instructor: ONEILL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 195
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	805/1481	4.29	4.27	4.29	4.45	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1355/1481	3.43	4.12	4.23	4.32	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.44	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.05	4.21	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1025/1396	3.60	4.05	3.98	4.09	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	649/1342	4.14	3.77	4.07	4.21	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1288/1459	3.43	4.09	4.16	4.25	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	722/1450	4.17	3.87	4.09	4.28	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1261/1409	3.71	4.36	4.42	4.51	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1168/1407	4.43	4.54	4.69	4.79	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1178/1399	3.71	4.12	4.26	4.36	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	844/1400	4.29	4.14	4.27	4.38	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	760/1179	3.80	3.89	3.96	4.07	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1059/1262	3.33	3.70	4.05	4.33	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1067/1259	3.67	4.00	4.29	4.57	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1069/1256	3.67	3.88	4.30	4.60	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.82	4.00	4.26	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 430 0101
 Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: WEBER, CARL S
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 196
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	5	6	3.75	1254/1481	3.75	4.27	4.29	4.45	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1136/1481	3.88	4.12	4.23	4.32	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	3	6	3.69	1076/1249	3.69	4.12	4.27	4.44	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1224/1424	3.67	4.05	4.21	4.35	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	972/1396	3.69	4.05	3.98	4.09	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	3.77	4.07	4.21	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1219/1459	3.63	4.09	4.16	4.25	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	491/1480	4.93	4.84	4.68	4.74	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	5	3	4	3.64	1170/1450	3.64	3.87	4.09	4.28	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	1	7	5	3.81	1236/1409	3.81	4.36	4.42	4.51	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.54	4.69	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	5	3	5	3.67	1196/1399	3.67	4.12	4.26	4.36	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	1	8	3.75	1145/1400	3.75	4.14	4.27	4.38	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.89	3.96	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	1	0	1	2.50	1223/1262	2.50	3.70	4.05	4.33	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1162/1259	3.00	4.00	4.29	4.57	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1151/1256	3.20	3.88	4.30	4.60	3.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.26	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	3.87	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	4.29	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.53	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.56	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 430 0101
 Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: WEBER, CARL S
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 196
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	7	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	11				
				?	6						

Course-Section: BIOL 434 0101
 Title MICROBIAL MOLEC GENETI
 Instructor: WOLF, RICHARD E
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 197
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	461/1481	4.61	4.27	4.29	4.45	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	286/1481	4.70	4.12	4.23	4.32	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	166/1249	4.87	4.12	4.27	4.44	4.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	152/1424	4.87	4.05	4.21	4.35	4.87	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	18	4.68	177/1396	4.68	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	755/1342	4.00	3.77	4.07	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	155/1459	4.82	4.09	4.16	4.25	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	252/1450	4.61	3.87	4.09	4.28	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	246/1409	4.87	4.36	4.42	4.51	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	250/1407	4.96	4.54	4.69	4.79	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	195/1399	4.83	4.12	4.26	4.36	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	187/1400	4.87	4.14	4.27	4.38	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	570/1179	4.07	3.89	3.96	4.07	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	305/1262	4.59	3.70	4.05	4.33	4.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	413/1259	4.71	4.00	4.29	4.57	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	345/1256	4.76	3.88	4.30	4.60	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	18
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 444 0101
 Title DEVELOPMENT AND CANCER
 Instructor: BIEBERICH, CHAR
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 198
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	233/1481	4.80	4.27	4.29	4.45	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	246/1481	4.73	4.12	4.23	4.32	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	172/1249	4.86	4.12	4.27	4.44	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	406/1424	4.53	4.05	4.21	4.35	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	111/1396	4.80	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	144/1342	4.73	3.77	4.07	4.21	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	520/1459	4.47	4.09	4.16	4.25	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	159/1450	4.77	3.87	4.09	4.28	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	450/1409	4.73	4.36	4.42	4.51	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	350/1407	4.93	4.54	4.69	4.79	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	683/1399	4.40	4.12	4.26	4.36	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	636/1400	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.38	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	243/1179	4.54	3.89	3.96	4.07	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	264/1262	4.67	3.70	4.05	4.33	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.00	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1256	5.00	3.88	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 456 0101
 Title PLANT MOLECULAR BIOLOG
 Instructor: MILLER, STEPHEN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 199
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	127/1481	4.93	4.27	4.29	4.45	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	149/1481	4.86	4.12	4.23	4.32	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	7	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.12	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	109/1424	4.93	4.05	4.21	4.35	4.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	65/1396	4.92	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	257/1342	4.57	3.77	4.07	4.21	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	131/1459	4.86	4.09	4.16	4.25	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1245/1480	4.21	4.84	4.68	4.74	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	89/1450	4.92	3.87	4.09	4.28	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.36	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	178/1399	4.85	4.12	4.26	4.36	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	385/1400	4.69	4.14	4.27	4.38	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	108/1179	4.82	3.89	3.96	4.07	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	249/1262	4.70	3.70	4.05	4.33	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.00	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1256	5.00	3.88	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	291/ 788	4.25	3.82	4.00	4.26	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 2		

Course-Section: BIOL 457 0101
 Title PHYS:MARINE/EST ANIMAL
 Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 200
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.27	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	661/1481	4.40	4.12	4.23	4.32	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	810/1249	4.17	4.12	4.27	4.44	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	165/1424	4.83	4.05	4.21	4.35	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	554/1396	4.20	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	934/1342	3.83	3.77	4.07	4.21	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1101/1459	3.83	4.09	4.16	4.25	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	3.87	4.09	4.28	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.36	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	910/1399	4.17	4.12	4.26	4.36	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.14	4.27	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.89	3.96	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	****	3.70	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 476 0101
 Title ANTIBIOTICS
 Instructor: LOVETT, PAUL S
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 201
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.27	4.29	4.45	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	603/1481	4.45	4.12	4.23	4.32	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	703/1249	4.30	4.12	4.27	4.44	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	807/1424	4.20	4.05	4.21	4.35	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	419/1396	4.35	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	5	7	6	4.06	725/1342	4.06	3.77	4.07	4.21	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	827/1459	4.20	4.09	4.16	4.25	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	7	6	3	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	3.87	4.09	4.28	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	705/1409	4.55	4.36	4.42	4.51	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	823/1407	4.75	4.54	4.69	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	783/1399	4.30	4.12	4.26	4.36	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	658/1400	4.45	4.14	4.27	4.38	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	860/1179	3.60	3.89	3.96	4.07	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	284/1262	4.63	3.70	4.05	4.33	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.00	4.29	4.57	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	496/1256	4.63	3.88	4.30	4.60	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	5
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101
 Title SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS
 Instructor: LINDAHL, LASSE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 202
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	613/1481	4.45	4.27	4.29	4.45	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	5	1	3.45	1342/1481	3.45	4.12	4.23	4.32	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	5	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.12	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1242/1424	3.60	4.05	4.21	4.35	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	1	2	3.10	1272/1396	3.10	4.05	3.98	4.09	3.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1071/1342	3.60	3.77	4.07	4.21	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	5	1	0	2.50	1429/1459	2.50	4.09	4.16	4.25	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	702/1480	4.90	4.84	4.68	4.74	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	3.87	4.09	4.28	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	924/1409	4.38	4.36	4.42	4.51	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1053/1407	4.57	4.54	4.69	4.79	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1120/1399	3.86	4.12	4.26	4.36	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	681/1400	4.43	4.14	4.27	4.38	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	340/1179	4.40	3.89	3.96	4.07	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	570/1262	4.25	3.70	4.05	4.33	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.00	4.29	4.57	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	773/1256	4.25	3.88	4.30	4.60	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	3.82	4.00	4.26	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.29	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant