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

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		109		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		147		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		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		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		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		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
1. Were special ecominques successful		3			23	3,5	0,	1.02	3317 700	1.02	3.02	1.00	3.00	1.02
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		****/ 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	5.00	****/ 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		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	208	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
J. Dia conferences help you early out fred activities	200	U	_	U	U		_	٥. ٥٥	/ 31			1.74		
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	****

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	60	0.00-0.99	0	 А	62	Required for Majors	39	Graduate	1	Major	61
28-55	37	1.00-1.99	5	В	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	s there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	147				
				?	8						

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101 University of Maryland Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR Baltimore County

Spring 2006 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 12

Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ollegtion	n $a$ $r$ $a$

Page 142

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Ω	Ω	Λ	Λ	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		1160/1481	3.83	4.12	4.23	4.14	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	2	3	1		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	1	4.08	655/1396		4.05	3.98	3.89	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	0	5	1		1195/1342	3.30	3.77	4.07	3.88	3.30
· ·	0	0	2	0	0	6	4		1195/1342	3.83	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480		4.84	4.16	4.17	5.00
<u>.</u>	0	0	2	1	0	0	12		1/1480		3.87		3.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	2	Τ	ь	3	U	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		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
o. Dia addiovidual commissão cimanos jour anacistanaring	Ü	Ü	Ū	5	_		-	3.07	010/11/5	3.01	3.03	3.70	3.03	3.01
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
		=	-	=	=	-	_		- ,					
Frequ	encv	Dist	ribu	ation	ı									
1	- 2													

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	Α	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101 University of Maryla
Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR Baltimore County
Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS (Instr. B) Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Grad.

3.50-4.00 9

Ρ

I

0

0

Questionnaires: 12

14

University of Maryland Page 143
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

c	tudent (	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera:	 L															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om 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 th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	1160/1481	3.83	4.12	4.23	4.18	3.83
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	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 ot	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	3	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1352/1424	3.11	4.05	4.21	4.06	3.11
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ate 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 wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	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 th	ne grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	2	0	0	6	4	3.83	1101/1459	3.83	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.83
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	722/1450	3.50	3.87	4.09	3.97	3.50
		Lecture	<b>e</b>															
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lectures	s 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 th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested :	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 le	ecture mat	terial presented	d 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 th	ne lecture	es 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 av	udiovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	your understanding	2	1	1	0	2	5	1	3.56	877/1179	3.61	3.89	3.96	3.85	3.61
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu			what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	680/1262	4.08	3.70	4.05	3.77	4.08
				ed to participate	0	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.00	4.29	4.06	4.33
		-	_	nd 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 s	special te	echniques succes	ssful	-	0	1	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	372/ 788	4.09	3.82	4.00	3.80	4.09
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ıt.i.or	ı									
					2													
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor:	 s	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	в 5			-			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														

Electives

9

Other

University of Maryland Baltimore County

CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 18

CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. A)

Page 144 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2006

			Fre	eque	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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			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
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	0	2	2	2	2			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			811/1480	4.88	4.84	4.68		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
T a selection														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	_	0	1	2 00	1000/1400	2 00	1 20	4 40	1 20	3.74
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	-	-	-	-	6	8			1222/1409	3.88	4.36	4.42	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	5	8	4		1342/1407	3.87	4.54	4.69	4.57	3.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0 3	0 2	1 2	6 5	8 4	3 2		1174/1399	3.69	4.12	4.26	4.23	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					-	_	_		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		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		1216/1256	2.91	3.88	4.30	4.08	2.60
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 788			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	1.5	0	-	0	0	-	-	2 22		als als als als	ale ale ale ale	4 40	4 = 4	****
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		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
3. Dia conferences help you early out fred accivities	10	U	J	_	_	J	U	2.50	, 31			1.72		
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	***

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 18

LAASSEN, LARK (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 144 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Title Instructor:

CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 18

Page 145 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		****/1179	3.49	3.89	3.96		3.76
o. Dia addiovidual coomingado cimanoc four anacidomaring		_	Ü	Ü	-	ŭ	_	1.55	,	3.15	3.05	3.70	3.05	3.70
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		1216/1256	2.91	3.88	4.30	4.08	2.60
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 788		3.82		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		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		4.20	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
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	3	Ü	Ü	_	_	_		1.10	01/ 21/	3.70	1.27	1.01	1.02	1.10
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		****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.80	****
o. Here official for grading made official		Ū	_	Ü	ŭ	_	Ü	2.50	, 55			3.72	3.00	
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	****	****
J. 214 JUNE 21 CHOCK HELP 104 CALLY OUT LICIA ACCIVICIES	- 0	J	J	_	_	0	•	2.50	, 31			1.12		
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		****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.58	****
J. Here energy proceeds for all the seadenes	-0	9	-	J	-	9	U	2.00	/ 21			1.02	1.50	

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. B)

Questionnaires: 18

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 145 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 22

ASSEN, LARK Spring 2006

Page 146 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
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		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		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		1259/1400		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		3.96		3.48
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		U	U	4	2	4	0	3.40	909/11/9	3.43	3.03	3.90	3.05	3.40
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		4.29	4.04		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	****
5. Hab one importance available for comparedon		ŭ	Ü	ŭ	_	Ü	_	1.00	, 30			1.00	3.00	
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	****

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

CLAASSEN, LARK

Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 19

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 147 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaner	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
~ 														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	,	****	****	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	****

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: Questionnaires: 19

CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 20 Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 147 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 6

Spring 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 148 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	1	1		1432/1481		4.27	4.29	4.14	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	0		1371/1481		4.12	4.23	4.18	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	1	1		1177/1249		4.12	4.27	4.14	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	2		1138/1424		4.05	4.21	4.06	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	1		1167/1396		4.05	3.98	3.89	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	2		1186/1342		3.77	4.07	3.88	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	1		1101/1459		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		4.84	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		1107/1407		4.54	4.69	4.57	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	0		1308/1399		4.12	4.26	4.23	3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	0	2		1120/1400		4.14	4.27	4.19	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	1	2		739/1179		3.89	3.96	3.85	3.83
5. Did additioning teening the second	U	O	O	O	5	_	2	3.03	733/1173	3.15	3.05	3.70	3.03	3.03
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			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		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			4.54	4.40	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	,		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
Openia por														
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		****	****	4.49	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.10	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,	****	****	4.44	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,	****	****	3.92	3.80	****
J. Were effected for grading made effect	3	O	O	_	O	O	U	2.00	, 00			3.72	3.00	
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	, -	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 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	, -	****	****	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	****

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 6

CEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA Baltimore County
ASSEN, LARK Spring 2006

Page 148 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 21

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 149 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions				- 4 4	ncies	,		TILD	tructor	Course	: Debr	ONDC	пелет	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		1113/1249	3.59	4.12	4.27		3.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	3	3	3	5	4		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 learne	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 effectivenes	s 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 informatio	n 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	****
Fre	quency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	3			Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 150 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

				-	ncies	5			tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		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		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		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														
	0	0	_	0	0	0	1	1 [7	1056/1060	0 71	3.70	4.05	2 77	1.57
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	6 3	2	0	0	1		1256/1262 1246/1259	2.71 3.16	4.00	4.05	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9 9	0	3	0	1	0	Τ		1246/1259	2.91	3.88	4.29	4.06 4.08	2.14
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	3 1	1	0	2	0	2.29	742/ 788	2.75	3.88	4.30	3.80	2.29
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	Т	U	۷	U	2.75	742/ 700	2.75	3.04	4.00	3.00	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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_		_	
				2	0						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 16

JAASSEN, LARK Spring 2006 .7 Page 151 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Fr									_				
				-	ncies	,	_		tructor	Course	_	-	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		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		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		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		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	Λ	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		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		1042/1256		3.88	4.30	4.08	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 788		3.82	4.00	3.80	****
i. Were special ecomiques successful		-	0	_	-	Ü	Ü	2.50	, , , , ,	2.75	3.02	1.00	3.00	
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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_		_	
				?	1						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 12

Baltimore County Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Page 152 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	Ω	Λ	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		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		****/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	****
- 1														
Laboratory	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	4 4 5	07/046	4 0 4	4 42	4 00	2 02	4 4 5
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	Τ	0	0	Ţ	Ţ		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		4.54	4.40	4.33	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	-	1	∠ 1	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	U	0	Τ	1	2	8	4.42	79/ 217	3.96	4.29	4.04	4.02	4.42

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

CLAASSEN, LARK

Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 14

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 153 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	4		1193/1481			4.29	4.14	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	6	1		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		1066/1249	3.59	4.12	4.27		3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	3	5	1		1316/1424			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		4.05	3.98	3.89	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	7	2		1023/1342		3.77	4.07	3.88	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	0	3			1148/1459			4.16	4.17	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1			561/1480		4.84	4.68		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		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	-		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		1017/1400		4.14	4.27	4.19	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	3	1	4		780/1179	3.49	3.89	3.96		3.78
J. Did addiovibaar teelmiques elmanee your anderstanding	3	2	_	O	5	_	-	3.70	700/11/2	3.15	3.05	3.50	3.03	3.70
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		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	11	-1	0	^	1	1	_	2 50	****/ 60			4 40	4 54	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 68 ****/ 69	****	****	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	, 05		****	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	1 1	1	3.67	****/ 63 ****/ 69	****	****	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11 11	0 1	0	1 1	0	1	1	3.07	, 0,	****	****	4.35 3.92	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	11		U	Т	U	Τ	U	3.00	/ 68			3.94	3.00	
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		****/ 31	****	****	4.42	****	****
7 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -		_	-	-	_	_	-		, 31					
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	****

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 123 0101 University of Maryland Title HUMAN GENETICS Baltimore County Instructor: GETHMANN, RICHA

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 78

111

Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 154

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 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 5 14 10 18 3.55 980/1262 3.55 3.70 4.05 3.77 3.55 6 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 Ω 1 Ω 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 240 \*\*\*\* 4.53 4.20 4.20 \*\*\*\* Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 68 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.49 4.54 \*\*\*\* 76 1 0 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 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 59 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.30 4.00 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.00 3.44 \*\*\*\* 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 77 0 Ω 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 51 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 77 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 36 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.60 5.00 \*\*\*\* 77 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 41 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.26 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 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 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 55 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.55 4.48 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 31 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.75 4.42 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 77 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 \*\*\*\* 77 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 24 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.82 4.58 \*\*\*\* 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

Course-Section: BIOL 123 0101
Title HUMAN GENETICS
Instructor: GETHMANN, RICHA

111

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 78

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 154 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				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

			Fre	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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														
	0	0	0	1	1	11	16	4.31	990/1409	4.31	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.31
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	11	32	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.54	4.42	4.47	5.00
·	0	0	0	0	6	12	14	4.25	828/1399	4.25	4.12	4.09	4.76	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	12	16	4.25	741/1400	4.25	4.14	4.27	4.29	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	19	2	0	3	1	5	3.64	850/1179		3.89	3.96	4.05	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	۷	19	2	U	3	1	5	3.04	050/11/9	3.04	3.09	3.90	4.05	3.04
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	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	32	Non-major	30
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	24	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 252 0101

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Baltimore County FLEISCHMANN, ES Spring 2006

Page 156 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

95 Questionnaires: 71

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	-	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_	_												
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	6	60	4.85	196/1481		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		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		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		****/ 217	****	4.29	4.20	4.28	****
J. Were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	23	,	U	U	U	1	10	4.91	/ 21/		1.20	1.01	1.20	
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		****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****
		Ŭ	•	_	•	•	_		, 31			02		

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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	54	_			
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0101 University of Maryland Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A) Enrollment:

20 Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 157 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

						Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General															
1. Did s	vou gain n	ew insights,skills fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	292/1481	4.90	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.75
-		ctor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	228/1481	4.71	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.75
		uestions reflect the e		0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	245/1249	4.66	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.75
	_	uations reflect the ex	_	0	3	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	695/1424	4.18	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.29
		eadings contribute to		0	1	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	257/1396	4.56	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.58
6. Did v	written as	signments contribute t	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 t	the gradin	g system clearly expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	196/1459	4.80	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.75
		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 v	would you	grade the overall teac	ching 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 instr	uctor'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 t	the instru	ctor seem interested i	n 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 ma	terial presented and e	explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	480/1399	4.44	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.54
		es contribute to what	-	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62			4.14	4.27	4.34	4.47
5. Did a	audiovisua	our understanding	6	3	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	192/1179	4.00	3.89	3.96	4.05	4.73	
		Discussion															
		ussions contribute to	-	17	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1262		3.70	4.05	4.11	****
		nts actively encourage		17	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/1259	4.61	4.00	4.29	4.34	****
		ctor encourage fair ar	nd open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/1256		3.88	4.30	4.28	****
4. Were	special t	echniques successful		17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	4.60	3.82	4.00	3.98	****
		Laboratory															
		crease understanding o		5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	57/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.67
		ded with adequate back		5	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	21/ 249	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.87
	_	materials available f		5	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 242		4.54	4.40	4.63	5.00
		structor provide assis		5	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	69/ 240		4.53	4.20	4.58	4.73
5. Were	requireme	nts for lab reports cl	early specified	6	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 217	4.56	4.29	4.04	4.28	****
			Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			ТУ	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0			Rec	 mir	 ed f	or Ma			0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	3	
28-55	2	B 12		1,00	74TT	Ju I	OT 1/10	בטנ.	5	0	Graduat	_	J	1.100 )	<i>,</i> _	5	
56-83	5		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	0	Non-	-major	17		
84-150		2.00-2.99 2 3.00-3.49 10	C 2 D 0		001		_				-	011001 9		-	2.011		
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1		here a		_	ſh	

Other

17

Ρ

Ι

0

0

1

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0101 University of Maryland Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 158

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: (Instr. B) Enrollment: 20 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Questionnaires: 20

						Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		General															
l. Did you	gain ne	ew insights, skills fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	292/1481	4.90	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.7
		ctor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	228/1481	4.71	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.
. Did the	exam qu	estions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	245/1249	4.66	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.
. Did oth	er evalı	ations reflect the ex	spected goals	0	3	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	695/1424	4.18	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.
. Did ass	igned re	eadings 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.
. Did wri	tten ass	signments 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.
. Was the	grading	g system clearly expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	196/1459	4.80	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.
. How man	y times	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.68	5.
. How wou	ld you g	grade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1030/1450	4.14	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.
		Lecture															
. Were the	e instru	actor's lectures well	prepared	13	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	483/1409	4.49	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.
. Did the	instruc	ctor 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.
. Was lec	lecture material presented and explained clear the lectures contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	567/1399	4.44	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.
. Did the	the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	791/1400	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.
. Did aud	audiovisual techniques enhance your understand				1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	104/1179	4.00	3.89	3.96	4.05	4.
		Discussion															
. Did cla	ss discu	ussions contribute to	what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1262	4.25	3.70	4.05	4.11	* *
. Were al	l studer	nts actively encourage	ed to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1259	4.61	4.00	4.29	4.34	* *
. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1256	4.68	3.88	4.30	4.28	* *
. Were sp	ecial te	echniques successful	_	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	4.60	3.82	4.00	3.98	* *
		Laboratory															
. Did the	lab ind	crease understanding o	of the material	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	57/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.
. Were yo	u provid	ded with adequate back	ground information	5	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	21/ 249	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.
. Were ne	cessary	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.
. Did the	lab ins	structor provide assis	stance	5	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	69/ 240	4.64	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.
. Were re	quiremer	nts for lab reports c	learly specified	6	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 217	4.56	4.29	4.04	4.28	* *
			Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
redits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	 A 3		Red	anir	ed f	or Ma	aior		0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or		
28-55					1000	2411	ca I	OT 1,10	בט כ ג		J	Graduat	_	•	1.101		
56-83	5	C 2		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad ?	0	Non-	-major	1	
34-150	4	D 0		061	c.a	_				J	onaci -g	144 2		14011			
Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 10 3.50-4.00 0	F 0		E14	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means +	here a	re not	enouc	тh
Ji aa.	U	3.30 1.00 0	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v C D				_	respons				_	,
			I 0		O+1	her				1	.7	respoils	LD LU L	C DIGI.	ıııcal	10	
			2 1		ULI	TICI				1	. /						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0201 University of Maryland
Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore County

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore County Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A) Spring 2006

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 159

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		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		****/1179	4.00	3.89	3.96	4.05	****
Laboratory	_				_		_		401.045	4 00				
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	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed 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	В	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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	qnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-	•	_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0201 University of Maryland JUN 13, 2006

Page 160

Job IRBR3029

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. B) Spring 2006

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1481	4.90	4.27	4.29	4.40	5.0
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	4.5
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	4.3
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	4.1
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	4.5
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	3.5
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	4.6
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	5.0
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	4.0
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	4.3
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	4.2
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	4.3
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.
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.
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.
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.
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.
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	**
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00.07														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-	_		
				_	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0201 University of Maryland JUN 13, 2006

Page 161

Job IRBR3029

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. C) Spring 2006

Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I

0

		0			NTE			-	ncies		_		ructor		Dept		Level	
		Question	.S		NR	NA	1	2	3 	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Meai
		Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1481	4.90	4.27	4.29	4.40	5.0
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	2	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	481/1481	4.71	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.5
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	639/1249	4.66	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.3
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	2	2	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	818/1424	4.18	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.1
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	252/1396	4.56	4.05	3.98	3.94	4.5
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	1	5	3.54	1101/1342	3.52	3.77	4.07	4.05	3.5
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	242/1459	4.80	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.6
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.68	5.0
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	.ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	836/1450	4.14	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.0
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	968/1409	4.49	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.3
		ctor seem inter			6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1221/1407		4.54	4.69	4.78	4.2
3. Was le	ecture ma	explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	753/1399	4.44	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.2		
		you learned	6	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	890/1400	4.47	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.3		
		your understanding	6	6	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1179	4.00	3.89	3.96	4.05	***		
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab in	crease understa	nding o	of the material	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	40/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.7
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequa	te bacl	ground information	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	69/ 249	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.5
3. Were n	necessary	materials avai	lable :	for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	106/ 242	4.66	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.5
4. Did th	ne lab in	structor provid	e assi	stance	6	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	137/ 240	4.64	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.3
5. Were r	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts c	learly specified	6	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	4.56	4.29	4.04	4.28	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Carned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 3					or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	Majo		2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 10		Red	4ull (	eu I	JT IMG	וטני	D	U	Graduat	E	U	Majo	JΤ	۷
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Cer	nora	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	L5	Non-	-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	General						4	onder-9	ıau l	LJ	11011-	ilia JUI	13	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives							0	#### -	Meane +	here a	re not	enous	rh
orau.	U	3.30-4.00	U	P 0		17.7	CCCI	v C D				U	respons				_	111
				P U		0.1					_	_	respons	es to t	)e 8191	ıııcaı	1 L	

Other

13

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0301 University of Maryland Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 162

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A) Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 20 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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		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		1044/1342		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		3.96	4.05	3.99
Diamondon														
Discussion	1 4	0	0	0	1	0	_	4 67	064/1060	4 05	2 70	4 05	4 11	4 60
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14 13	0	0	0	0	0	5	4.67 4.71	264/1262 402/1259	4.25 4.61	3.70 4.00	4.05 4.29	4.11 4.34	4.67 4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	5 6	4.71	256/1256	4.61	3.88	4.29	4.28	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	0	2	3		152/ 788		3.82	4.00	3.98	
1. Wele special techniques successful	13	2	O	Ü	O	2	3	1.00	132/ 700	1.00	3.02	1.00	3.70	1.00
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
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	า									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0301 University of Maryland
Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore County

Ι

?

0

0

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 163

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 20 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

(Instr. B)

Instructor:

							_	ncies	5			tructor	Course	_			Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1481	4.90	4.27	4.29	4.40	5.00
		tor make clear the		0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	69/1481	4.71	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.95
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions 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 ot	her evalu	ations 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 as	signed re	eadings contribute t	o 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 wr	ritten ass	signments 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 th	ne grading	g system clearly exp	lained	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	101/1459	4.80	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.90
8. How ma	ny 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 wo	ould you g	grade the overall to	aching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	4	7	0	3.31	1294/1450	4.14	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.00
		Lecture															
		ctor's lectures wel		11	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	968/1409		4.36	4.42	4.47	4.64
		tor seem interested		11	0	0	0	1	3	5		1153/1407		4.54	4.69	4.78	4.72
		erial presented and	-	11	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	956/1399		4.12	4.26	4.29	4.50
		es contribute to wha		11	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11			4.14	4.27	4.34	4.50
5. Did au	ıdiovisual	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															
		ssions contribute t		14	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	264/1262		3.70	4.05	4.11	4.67
		nts actively encoura		13	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	. ,		4.00	4.29	4.34	4.71
			and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256		3.88	4.30	4.28	4.86
4. Were s	special te	echniques successful		13	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	152/ 788	4.60	3.82	4.00	3.98	4.60
		Laboratory															
		rease understanding		4	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	16/ 246		4.43	4.20	4.51	4.94
			ckground information	4	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	19/ 249		4.45	4.11	4.32	4.88
	_		for lab activities	4	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	113/ 242		4.54	4.40	4.63	4.50
		structor provide ass		4	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	51/ 240		4.53	4.20	4.58	4.81
5. Were r	requiremen	nts 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
			Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9		Red		ed f	or Ma	aior	 S	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55									J						5		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 4	C 1		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 2	0	Non-	major	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 10	D 0													-	
Grad.						ecti	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
			P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
			т 0		O+1	h 0 20				1	6	-		_			

Other

16

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0401 University of Maryland Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Baltimore County

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 19

JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 164

Student	Course	Evaluation	Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	--------	----------

				equer					ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	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	Ο	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		****/ 788	4.60	3.82	4.00	3.98	***
T albamat area														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	1 2	4.81	33/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	A E1	1 01
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3 3	0	0	0	0 1	.5 1	13 14	4.81	33/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	4.51 4.32	4.81 4.81
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	94/ 242	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.63	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	51/ 240	4.64	4.54	4.40	4.58	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	9	0	0	0	2	T 2	4.71	42/ 217	4.56	4.29	4.20	4.28	4.71
J. Were requirements for rap reports crearry specified	3	9	U	U	U	2	5	T./1	42/ ZI/	4.50	1.43	1.04	7.20	4./I

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0401 University of Maryland Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Baltimore County

Page 165

JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Instructor:		(Instr. B)	Spring 2006
Enrollment:	21		

Ρ

I

0

1

Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
		Genera																
		new insights,ski			0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	256/1481		4.27	4.29	4.40	4.79
		ructor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	299/1481		4.12	4.23	4.29	4.68
		questions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	219/1249		4.12	4.27	4.36	4.79
		aluations reflect			0	1	0	1	4	2	11	4.28	717/1424		4.05	4.21	4.28	4.28
		readings contrib			0	2	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	321/1396		4.05	3.98	3.94	4.47
				to what you learned	0	2	1	3	3	6	4		1106/1342		3.77	4.07	4.05	3.53
		ing system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	107/1459		4.09	4.16	4.17	4.89
	-	es was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480		4.84	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How	w would yo	u grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	672/1450	4.14	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.25
		Lectur	e															
1. Wer	re the ins	tructor's lecture	s well	prepared	7	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	878/1409	4.49	4.36	4.42	4.47	4.49
		ructor seem inter			7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	659/1407	4.63	4.54	4.69	4.78	4.85
		material presente			7	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	567/1399	4.44	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.56
		ures contribute t		-	7	0	0	0	1	2	9		421/1400		4.14	4.27		4.68
				your understanding	8	6	2	0	0	1	2		1011/1179		3.89	3.96		3.29
		-	_	5														
		Discus																
		scussions contrib		-	13	0	0	0	1	5		3.83	842/1262		3.70	4.05	4.11	3.83
		dents actively en			13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	588/1259		4.00	4.29	4.34	4.50
		_		nd open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	571/1256		3.88	4.30	4.28	4.50
4. Wer	re special	techniques succe	ssful		13	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 788	4.60	3.82	4.00	3.98	***
		Labora	tory															
1. Did	d the lab	increase understa	nding c	of the material	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	33/ 246	4.80	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.81
			_	ground information	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	31/ 249		4.45	4.11	4.32	4.81
				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	d the lab	instructor provid	e assis	stance	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	51/ 240	4.64	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.81
		ments for lab rep			3	9	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	42/ 217	4.56	4.29	4.04	4.28	4.71
				Fig. 2		- D-1 L												
				Frequ	епсу	DISC	LID	ucioi	1									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	:			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	7 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Rec	uir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	`s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	1
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	В 8		-				J								
56-83		2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	major	18
84-15	50 2	3.00-3.49	5	D 0													-	
Grad.	. 0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				D 0	Electives									1-			_	

Other

16

Course-Section: BIOL 275 0101 Title

University of Maryland MICROBIOLOGY Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 178 Questionnaires: 89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 166 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Questions				Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, akills from this course   2 0 2 6 11 24 44 4,17 934/481 4,17 4,27 4,29 4,40 4,17	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, akills from this course   2 0 0 3 11 73 62 03 3.64 1244   4.17 9.84/1481   4.17 4.27 4.29 4.40 4.17   2.18   2.10   2. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2 1 1 10 18 36 21 3.77 1041/1249   3.77 4.12 4.27 4.36 3.77   4.10   4.17   4.18   4.1															
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 3.01 dthe exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 1 1 10 18 36 21 3.77 1041/1249 3.77 4.12 4.27 4.36 3.77 4.10 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 69 0 1 7 3 6 3.82 *****/1424 ***** 4.05 4.21 4.28 ***** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 9 5 2 11 26 31 70 700/1336 4.01 4.05 3.28 3.94 4.01 6.11 divitten assignments contribute to what you learned 4 72 0 2 2 4 5 3.92 *****/1424 **** 4.05 4.21 4.28 ***** 5. Did assignments contribute to what you learned 4 72 0 2 2 4 5 3.92 ****/1424 **** 4.07 4.07 4.05 **** 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5 1 0 1 2 2 8 2 9 25 104/1450 3.90 4.09 4.16 4.17 3.90 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 1 0 1 2 2 8 20 55 4.47 813/1490 4.99 4.84 4.68 4.68 4.99 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 1 2 2 8 20 55 4.47 813/1490 4.99 4.84 4.68 4.69 4.79 1.79 1.79 1.79 1.79 1.79 1.79 1.79 1															
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   4.10			-	_											
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. The many times was class class was cancelled was cancelled was cancelled was cancelle	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
5. Did assigned readines contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Proceedings of the process of the proce	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	10	18	36	21	3.77	1041/1249	3.77	4.12	4.27	4.36	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	69	0	1	7	3	6	3.82	****/1424	****	4.05	4.21	4.28	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 1 2 24 31 20 3.86 1014/1450 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  Lec	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
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 1 2 24 31 20 3.86 1014/1480 3.78 4.84 4.88 4.89 4.99 4.84 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 0 1 2 24 31 20 3.86 1014/1480 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 1140/1339 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 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 3.99 3.96 4.05 4.24 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05 1.05	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	****
New would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   11	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
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  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  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 2 4.16 937/1400 4.19 4.17 4.27 4.34 4.91  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  6. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4. Were special techniques successful  1. Eaboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  2. Were pour provided with adequate background information  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  4. Were you provided with adequate background information  5. Were recessary materials available for lab activities  8. Were repairements for lab reports clearly specified  8. Did the lab instructor provide assistance  8. Were repairements for lab reports clearly specified  8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  8. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  8. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  8. Did you clearly understand your evaluations  8. Did you clearly understand your evaluations  8. Did you clearly un	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
1. Nere the instructor's lectures well prepared   3	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
1. Nere the instructor's lectures well prepared   3	Legtura														
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 4.78 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 3 5 22 92 6 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 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 0 2 2 9 4.29 ***/1266 **** 3.88 4.30 4.28 ****  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 75 0 1 0 2 2 9 4.29 ***/1256 **** 3.88 4.30 4.28 ****  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 86 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 5.00 ***/1788 **** 3.82 4.00 3.98 ****  2. Mere account with adequate background information 86 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ***/1789 **** 4.43 4.20 4.51 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 86 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/217 ***** 4.29 4.64 4.68 ****  3. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 86 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/242 ***** 4.54 4.40 4.63 ****  2. Ware requirements for lab reports clearly specified 86 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/217 ***** 4.29 4.04 4.28 ****  2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/68 **** 4.49 5.00 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/68 **** 4.49 5.00 ****  4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/68 **** 4.49 4.00 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/68 **** 4.49 4.00 ****  5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/68 **** 4.40 4.67 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/68 **** 4.40 4.67 ****  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/59 **** 4.55 4.44 ****  8. Did study questi		3	Ω	1	2	Ω	20	55	4 47	213/1400	4 49	4 36	4 42	4 47	4 49
3. Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Discussion  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Were you provided with adequate background information 7. Were you provided with adequate background information 7. Were you provided with adequate background information 7. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7. Were criteria for grading made clear 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 7. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 7. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 7. Did self-paced syst															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 74 0 2 2 2 2 3 6 3.60 ****/1259 ***** 4.00 4.29 4.34 ***** 3. Did the instructor 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 **** 4.00 4.28 *															
Discussion															
Discussion  Discussion  Discussions contribute to what you learned  Discussions  Discussions contribute to what you learned  Discussions  Discussi	<del>_</del>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 74 0 2 2 2 2 3 6 3.60 ****/1262 **** 3.70 4.05 4.11 **** 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 75 0 1 0 2 2 9 4.29 ****/1256 **** 3.88 4.30 4.28 **** 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 **** 4.80 **** 4	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	Τ	5	-7	21	37	4.24	457/1179	4.24	3.89	3.96	4.05	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 74 0 1 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 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 **** 4.52 **** 5.00 **** 6.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 75 0 1 0 2 2 2 9 4.29 ****/1256 **** 3.88 4.30 4.28 **** 4.80 Were special techniques successful 76 10 0 1 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 **** 2.80 Were you provided with adequate background information 86 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/249 **** 4.45 4.11 4.32 **** 4.10 did the lab instructor provide assistance 86 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/249 **** 4.45 4.11 4.32 **** 4.10 did the lab instructor provide assistance 86 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/217 **** 4.29 4.04 4.28 **** 5.80 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 86 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/217 **** 4.29 4.04 4.28 **** 5.80 Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 86 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/217 **** 4.29 4.04 4.28 **** 5.80 Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/68 **** 4.49 5.00 **** 2.80 Was the instructor available for individual attention 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/68 **** 4.49 5.00 **** 5.80 Were criteria for grading made clear 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/69 **** 4.33 4.33 **** 5.80 Were criteria for grading made clear 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/69 **** 4.35 4.72 **** 5.80 Were criteria for grading made clear 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/69 **** 4.30 4.67 **** 2.01 diyou clearly understand your evaluation criteria 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/69 **** 4.30 4.67 **** 2.01 diyou clearly understand your evaluations 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/51 **** 4.40 4.00 4.07 **** 5.01 did field experience contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/51 **** 4.40 4.00 4.07 **** 5.01 did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/51 **** 4.40 4.60 **** 5.01 did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/51 **** 4.40 4.60 **** 5.01 did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/51 **** 4.40 4.00 **** 5.01 did self-paced system contr	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	****
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 8. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 8. Did gressentations contribute to what you learned 8. Did gressentation	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	74	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	****/1259	***	4.00	4.29	4.34	****
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  2. Were you provided with adequate background information  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  3. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned  3. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  3. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  3. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  3. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  3. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  3. Did study questions make clear the expected goal  3. Did study questions by roctors helpful  3. Did study expected for the support of the s	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	****
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 4.40 4.63 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 86 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/ 240 **** 4.54 4.40 4.63 ****  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 **** 4.45 4.40 4.00 ****  3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** **** 4.53 4.83 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** **** 4.34 4.00 ****  5. Were criteria for grading made clear 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** **** 4.35 4.72 ****  5. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** **** 4.30 4.67 ****  5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** **** 4.30 4.67 ****  5. Did solferences help you carry out field activities 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 *** **** 4.30 4.67 ****  5. Did solf-paced system contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.20 4.69 ****  5. Did solf-paced system contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.20 4.69 ****  5. Did solf-paced system contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** *** 4.50 4.69 ****  5. Did solf-paced system contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.20 4.69 ****  5. Did solf-paced system contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.20 4.69 ****  5. Did solf-paced system contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.20 4.60 ****  4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.55 4.44	4. Were special techniques successful	76	10	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	3.98	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information   3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities   4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance   5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified   5. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   7. Were the instructor available for individual attention   7. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   7. Were criteria for grading made clear   7. Were criteria for grading made clear   7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned   7. Did you clearly understand your evaluation   7. Did you clearly understand your evaluation   7. Did conferences help you carry out field activities   7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   8. Did schopers helpful   8. Did schopers   8. Did schopers   8. Did Study questions make clear the expected goal   8. Did schopers   8. Did schopers   8. Did Study questions make clear the expected goal   8. Did Study questions make clear the expected goal   8. Did Study questions make clear the expected goal   8. Did Study questions make clear the expected goal   8. Did Study questions make clear the expected goal   8. Did Study questions by proctors helpful   8. Did Study questions by		06	0	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	****/ 216	****	1 12	4 20	/ E1	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities										,					
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance							-	_		,					
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme															
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified	80	U	U	U	U	Τ	۷	4.0/	~~~/ 21/		4.29	4.04	4.28	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	***	****	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** **** 4.30 4.67 ****  2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** **** 4.00 4.07 ****  3. Was the instructor available for consultation 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** **** 4.60 4.64 ****  4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 88 0 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 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 ****/ 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 **** **** 4.42 4.80 ****  Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 4.42 4.80 ****  3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** **** 4.55 4.66 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.83 4.43 ****	3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****
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 ****/ 51 **** **** 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 ****	4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.72	****
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 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 criteria for grading made clear	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria		QΩ	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	5 00	****/ E0	****	****	4 30	4 67	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation								1		,	****				
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 ****							-	1		, 51					
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** **** 4.42 4.80 ****  2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 88 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** **** 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 ****										, 50					
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 ****										, 11					
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. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	٥٥	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 31			4.42	4.80	
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 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** **** 4.65 4.66 ****  4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 88 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.83 4.43 ****															
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 1 5.00 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.83 4.43 ****							-	_		,					
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 88 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.83 4.43 ****		88			0		0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	
1. Was the recastally externing by proceeds herpful	3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	88	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	
		88	0		0		0	1		, 51	****	****	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 ****	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 University of Maryland Page 166 Title Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 MICROBIOLOGY Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 178

Questionnaires: 89 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	1	 А	18	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	are not enough	e not enough	
				P	0			responses to	onses to be significant		
				I	0	Other	67				
				?	4						

Course-Section: BIOL 275 0101 University of Maryland Page 167
Title MICROBIOLOGY Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006

Title MICROBIOLOGY Baltimore Count Instructor: (Instr. B) Spring 2006

Enrollment: 178

Questionnaires: 89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr	eque	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	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		141/1480		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		4.14	4.27		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		****/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	0.00	****/ 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 University of Maryland Page 167
Title MICROBIOLOGY Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 178
Questionnaires: 89

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

## Frequency Distribution

Spring 2006

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed 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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	67				
				?	4						

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	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	-	•	•	•	_	_	1.0	4 25	500/1401	4 50	4 00	4 00	4 40	4 25
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1 1	0	0	0	3 4	9	10 7	4.35	729/1481 917/1481	4.52 4.24	4.27 4.12	4.29	4.40	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.15 4.30	703/1249	4.24	4.12	4.23	4.29 4.36	4.15 4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	784/1424	4.38	4.12	4.27	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		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		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	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	2						

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Title

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

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General		_				_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	, -		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		4.12	4.23	4.29	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36			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	- ,		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		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		4.00	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		3.88	4.30	4.28	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	4	1		****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	3.98	****
1. Here special econicaes successive		3	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	_	1.20	, , , , , ,		3.02	1.00	3.70	
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				4.04	4.28	4.28
Seminar	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 68	****	****	1 10	E 00	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20				0	1	1		,			4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	,			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		****/ 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		****/ 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	****

Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor:

Baltimore County SANDOZ, JAMES W Spring 2006

Page 169 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	2						

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Title Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 21 Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 170 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Frequencies				s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	Ο	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	2	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		****/ 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		4.43	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		4.54	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
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	utior	1									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-		-	
				2	Λ						

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

			Fre	eauer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	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	5 7	11	4.38	682/1481	4.24	4.12	4.23	4.40	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	-	5.00	1/1480		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		3.87	4.09		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		4.12	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	1.0	0	1	0	2	1	2	2 62	040/1060	2 70	2 70	4 05	4 11	2 62
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1 1	0	3 1	1 2	3 4	3.63	949/1262		3.70	4.05	4.11	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13 13	0	2	0	1	2	3	4.00	895/1259 1106/1256	4.35 3.99	4.00 3.88	4.29 4.30	4.34 4.28	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	1	1	0	2		****/ 788	3.99 ****	3.82	4.00	3.98	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	U	_	1	U	4	3.73	/ / / 66		3.02	4.00	3.90	
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 0	1 4	14 13	4.44	-,	4.57	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.44
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	U	U	1	U	4	13	4.61	55/ 217	4.27	4.29	4.04	4.28	4.61
Seminar	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	-	F 00	****/ 60		****	4 40	F 00	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20 20	0	0	0	0 1	0	1		****/ 68 ****/ 69	****	****	4.49 4.53	5.00 4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	****	4.33	4.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.44	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		****/ 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	****

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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

The cluctor DANDOZ,

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 15

Spring 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 172 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	1		Inst	tructo	r	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ra	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L																
1. Did y	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	188/	1481	4.52	4.27	4.29	4.40	4.87
_		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	934/	1481	4.24	4.12	4.23	4.29	4.13
		estions reflect			0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	832/	1249	4.38	4.12	4.27	4.36	4.13
4. Did o	ther evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	684/	1424	4.38	4.05	4.21	4.28	4.31
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contrib	ate 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
				o 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 t	he grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	929/	1459	3.93	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.07
8. How m	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	756/	1480	4.82	4.84	4.68	4.68	4.87
9. How w	vould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	473/	1450	4.12	3.87	4.09	4.15	4.40
		Lecture	9																
1. Were	the instru	actor's lecture:	s 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 t	the instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 1	Lecture mat	erial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	2	7	4.07	980/	1399	4.15	4.12	4.26	4.29	4.07
4. Did t	the lecture	es 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 a	audiovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	419/	1179	3.96	3.89	3.96	4.05	4.29
	Discussion class discussions contribute to what you l																		
				_	10	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	437/	1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	4.11	4.40
	e all students actively encouraged to partic				10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/		4.35	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.80
	the instructor encourage fair and open disc				10	0	0	1	0	3	1		1025/		3.99	3.88	4.30	4.28	3.80
4. Were	re special techniques successful				10	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/	788	****	3.82	4.00	3.98	****
		Labora	_																
		crease understa			3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75		246	4.59	4.43	4.20	4.51	4.75
				ground information	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67		249	4.46	4.45	4.11	4.32	4.67
	_			or lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	113/		4.55	4.54	4.40	4.63	4.50
		structor provide			3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58		240	4.57	4.53	4.20	4.58	4.58
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	3	1	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	126/	217	4.27	4.29	4.04	4.28	4.09
1		Semina		2 2	1.4	0	•	•		•	-	F 00	ale ale ale ale /	60	de de de de	4.4.4.4.	4 40	F 00	de de de de
1. Were	assigned t	topics relevant	to the	announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	68	****	***	4.49	5.00	***
		Field N	Work																
	_			hat you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****
				uation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****
		ctor available :			13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****
	_	could you disc	_		13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****
5. Did c	conferences	s help you carry	y out f	ield activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****
						Dist	tribu	ution	ı										
Credits	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;				Тур	pe			Majors	5		
00-27	 6	A 2		Red	านา่า	 ed fo	or Ma	ior		0	 Gra	 duate	 p	0	Majo	 r	3		
28-55	2	В 8				\	10	. ,	_	-	S_C		-	-		_	J		
56-83	0	C 1		Gei	neral	1				0	Und	er-gi	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	12		
84-150	1	1 3.00-3.49 3 D																-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	###	# - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	<sub>j</sub> h
				P 0											es to b			_	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	4							
				0 1															

1

ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION

Title 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

Questions	NR	NA	Fro	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect 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		4.98	211/1480	4.98	4.84	4.68		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		0	_	0		0	_	2 42	**** /1000	ale ale ale ale	2 50	4 05	4 1 4	***
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	77	0	5	0	4 4	8	6		****/1262	****	3.70	4.05	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	77	0	3 2	0	3	5 3	11 15		****/1259 ****/1256	****	4.00	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	77 77	5	3	0	4	3 6	15 5		****/ 788	****	3.88	4.30	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	3	U	4	0	5	3.50	/ /00		3.04	4.00	4.07	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	97	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	97	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	97	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.36	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	97	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	0.0	0	-	0	0	•	-	2 00	****	ale ale ale ale	****	4 40	4 50	***
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		****/ 69 ****/ 63	****	****	4.53	4.66	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	98 98	1 1	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 63 ****/ 69	****	****	4.44	4.56	****
<ol> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were criteria for grading made clear</li> </ol>	98	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 68	****	****		4.48 4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	90	U	U		U	U	_	3.30	/ 00			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		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	98	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	****

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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	61				
				?	1						

Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION

258

Instructor:

Enrollment:

(Instr. B)

Page 174 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Questionnaires: 100 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	anie	ncie	S		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	2	4	15	34	41	4.13	986/1481		4.27	4.29	4.29	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	7	22	31	36		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		1197/1424		4.05	4.21	4.27	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	10	9	27	25	21		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		1207/1342		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		4.84	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		****/1259	****	4.00	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	77	0	2	0	3	3	15		****/1256	****	3.88	4.30	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	77	5	3	0	4	6	5		****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.07	****
r. Were special techniques successful	, ,	3	3	Ü	•	Ü	3	3.30	, , , , , ,		3.02	1.00	1.07	
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			****	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		****/ 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	2 00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	1 10	****
-							1		,	****	****		4.48	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	98	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	, -	****	****	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	98	1	0	0	0	0	1		,			4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	98	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	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	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

Questionnaires: 100

Page 174 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 258

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	61				
				?	1						

Title

Ins

Page 175 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

urse-Section:	BIOL 301	0101		University of Maryland	
tle	ECOLOGY &	EVOLUTION		Baltimore County	
structor:		(Instr.	C)	Spring 2006	
rollment:	258				

Enr Questionnaires: 100

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	:S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General	1	0	2	4	1 -	2.4	11	1 12	006/1401	4 12	4 07	4 20	4 20	4 12
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	2	4 7	15 22	34 31	41 36	4.13	986/1481		4.27	4.29 4.23	4.29	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	4	22	30	38	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals				4		14			893/1249		4.12			3.73
	4 5	47 3	2 10	9	14 27	25	15 21		1197/1424 1130/1396	3.73 3.41	4.05 4.05	4.21	4.27	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	42	10	5	13	10	14		1207/1342	3.25	3.77	4.07	4.12	3.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	3	16	29	45	4.21	809/1459	4.21	4.09	4.07	4.12	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	10	29	91	4.21	211/1480	4.21	4.09	4.18	4.17	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	1	1	1	15	43	11	3.87			3.87	4.09		3.90
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	_	1		13	13	11	3.07	JJ 1 / 1430	3.90	3.07	4.00	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		^	_	^	4	0	_	2 42	++++ /10C0	****	2 70	4 05	4 1 4	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	77	0	5 3	0	4	8	6		,	****	3.70	4.05	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	77	0	2		_	5	11	3.91	,	****	4.00	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	77 77	0 5	3	0	3 4	3 6	15 5	4.26	****/1256 ****/ 788	****	3.88	4.30	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	//	5	3	U	4	0	5	3.50	/ /00		3.04	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	0.0	^	-	^	^	^	-	2 22	****	المناسبان بالا		4	4 00	
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	, -	****	****	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	****

Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION

Instructor:

(Instr. C)

Enrollment: 258 Questionnaires: 100

Page 175 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	37						
56-83	19	2.00-2.99	7	С	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	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses t	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	61				
				?	1						

University of Maryland

Baltimore County MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI BRADLEY, BRIAN (Instr. A)

Spring 2006

Page 176 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 276

Title

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 59

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	9	7	14	15	11		1425/1481			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	****
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	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		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		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		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		1150/1179	2.80	3.89	3.96		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		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		1212/1256	2.78	3.88	4.30	4.34	2.78
4. Were special techniques successful	40	13	3	0	2	1	0		****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.07	****
4. Were special techniques successiui	40	13	3	U	4		U	2.17	/ /00		3.02	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	****
	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	***	****			****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation			0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.60 4.26	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	1 1	0	1	0	0		2.00	****/ 31	****	****		3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	Τ	U	Т	U	U	0	∠.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	****

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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	22	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	11
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	43				
				?	1						

Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI

Instructor:

Enrollment: 276 Questionnaires: 59

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 177

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor		Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran		Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_			_											
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	9	7	14	15	11		1425/1		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		1448/1		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		1159/1		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		****/1		****	4.05	4.21	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6 7	3 42	5 4	4	10	11 2	20 0	3.74	926/1 ****/1		3.74 ****	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	42	6	3 7	1 17	2 11	12					3.77	4.07 4.16	4.12 4.17	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	4	26	23	2		1327/1 1460/1		3.30 3.42	4.09 4.84	4.16	4.17	3.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	2	7	13	14			1291/1			3.87	4.09	4.10	2.94
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	U	4	,	13	14	5	3.34	1291/1	450	2.54	3.07	4.09	4.10	2.94
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	4	1	12	14	16	3.79	1243/1	409	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	1331/1	407	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	1341/1	399	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	1291/1	400	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	945/1	179	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		1229/1		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		1205/1		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		1212/1		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	****
Laboratowy															
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/	216	****	4.43	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/		****	4.45	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/		****	4.54	4.11	4.23	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/		****	4.53	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/		****	4.29	4.20	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	56	U	U	U		U	U	3.00	/	Z1 /		4.23	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		****/	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		****/	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 57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	51	****	****	4.75	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57 57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	34	****	***	4.83	4.88	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/	24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****
J. Here there chough proceeds for all the seudents	۱ د	_	U	_	U	U	U	2.00	,	27			1.02	1.07	

Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 177 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 276

Questionnaires: 59

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	22	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	11
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	43				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County Spring 2006

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 15

84-150

Grad.

3

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

4

2

D

F

Ρ

Ι

?

0

0

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 178 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

2								2										
							Fr	eque	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did 1701	, gain no	Genera w insights,ski		m this sourse	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	4.36	729/1481	1 21	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.36
_	_	tor make clear			1	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	517/1481		4.12	4.23	4.23	4.50
		estions reflec			1	0	2	0	0	6	6	4.00	893/1249		4.12	4.27	4.28	4.00
	_	ations reflect		_	2	2	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	717/1424		4.05	4.21	4.27	4.27
				what you learned	2	1	1	1	3	4	3		1036/1396		4.05	3.98	4.00	3.58
				o what you learned		0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	980/1342		3.77	4.07	4.12	3.77
		system clearl		_	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	635/1459	4.16	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.38
		was class cand			2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	561/1480	4.93	4.84	4.68	4.65	4.92
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	all teac	ching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	296/1450	4.35	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.56
		T a ##																
1 Were th	ne instru	Lectur actor's lecture		nrenared	2	0	0	0	0	Δ	q	4.69	514/1409	4.67	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.69
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	636/1407		4.54	4.69	4.67	4.85
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	256/1399		4.12	4.26	4.27	4.77
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	,		4.14	4.27	4.28	4.54
				our understanding	2	5	2	0	3	0	3	3.25	997/1179	3.93	3.89	3.96	4.02	3.25
1 Did ala		Discus		what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.33	507/1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	1 11	4.33
				ed to participate	9 9	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	836/1259		4.00	4.05	4.14 4.34	4.33
				nd open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	901/1256		3.88	4.30	4.34	4.00
		chniques succe		d open discussion	10	2	2	0	1	0	0		****/ 788		3.82	4.00	4.07	****
1	, corar oc	Joint Jaco Sacos				_	_	ŭ	_	ŭ	ŭ	1.07	,	2.07	3.02	1.00	1.07	
		Labora	-															
				of the material	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	89/ 246		4.43	4.20	4.20	4.44
				ground information		0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	114/ 249		4.45	4.11	4.23	4.33
	_			for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	106/ 242		4.54	4.40	4.36	4.56
		structor provid			6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	115/ 240		4.53	4.20	3.96	4.44
5. Were re	equiremen	its for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	6	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	110/ 217	4.58	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.22
				Free	quenc	y Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	۸	Expected Grades				Po	asons				Ту	ne			Majors	
CIECULO E		Cuiii. GPF		Expected Grades	, . – – – -					, 								, 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6				_				_	_	_	_			_
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 3		Ge	nera	.1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	6

Electives

Other

0

11

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0202 University of Maryland Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

?

0

Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 179

		Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m 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 th	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	spected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	736/1481	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.33
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflect	t the e	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 ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	908/1424	4.20	4.05	4.21	4.27	4.10
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	801/1396	3.78	4.05	3.98	4.00	3.91
				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
		system clearly	-	ined	1	0	0	1	2	4	3		1048/1459	4.16	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.90
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.84	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	722/1450	4.35	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.37
		Lecture	е															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture:	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.55
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	545/1407	4.77	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.82
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	567/1399	4.52	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.50
		s contribute to			1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	492/1400	4.56	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.61
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	3	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	340/1179	3.93	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.37
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studen	ts actively end	courage	ed 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 th	e instruc	tor encourage :	fair an	nd 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 s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		7	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	749/ 788	2.67	3.82	4.00	4.07	2.67
		Labora	torv															
1. Did th	e lab inc			of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	106/ 246	4.34	4.43	4.20	4.20	4.38
				ground information	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	23/ 249	4.55	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.86
				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 th	e lab ins	tructor provide	e assis	stance	4	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	119/ 240	4.48	4.53	4.20	3.96	4.43
5. Were r	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	27/ 217	4.58	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.86
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po:	asons				Ty	00			Majors	
CTEATER F				Expected Grades									ту.	 he			ria Jors	, . – – – –
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3		~ .		,				0	TT7		1	NT		_
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera!	T				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1 1	D 0 F 0		. רקד	ectiv					0	инии ,	Moona +	homo -			.h
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	Т	P 0		FT6	=CLT1	ves				U	#### - 1				_	ìtt
				I 0		<b>∩</b> +¹	ner					7	respons	es lo I	e sign	ıııcar	IL	
				1 0		OEI	ier.					/						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0202 University of Maryland
Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB Baltimore County

(Instr. B)

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 180

JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ρ

I

?

0

0

									_	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	 1															
1. D	oid vou	gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	928/1481	4.24	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.18
	_	_	ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	736/1481		4.12	4.23	4.23	4.33
			estions reflec			1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	854/1249		4.12	4.27	4.28	4.10
		_	ations reflect			1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	908/1424	4.20	4.05	4.21	4.27	4.10
5. D	oid ass	igned re	eadings contrib	ute 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
					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. W	Was the	grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1048/1459	4.16	4.09	4.16	4.17	3.90
8. H	low man	y times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.84	4.68	4.65	5.00
9. H	low wou	ld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	281/1450	4.35	3.87	4.09	4.10	4.37
			Lectur	е															
1. W	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared				prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	865/1409	4.67	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.55
2. D	oid the	id 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. W	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clear				explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	567/1399	4.52	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.50
4. D	as lecture material presented and explained clear id the lectures contribute to what you learned				you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	468/1400	4.56	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.61
5. D	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	384/1179	3.93	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.37
			Discus																
					what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	1	1		1108/1262		3.70	4.05	4.14	3.17
					ed to participate	5	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1067/1259	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.34	3.67
					nd open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	4	0		1084/1256		3.88	4.30	4.34	3.60
4. W	Were sp	ecial te	echniques succe	ssful		7	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	749/ 788	2.67	3.82	4.00	4.07	2.67
			Labora	_															
			crease understa	_		3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	106/ 246		4.43	4.20	4.20	4.38
					ground information	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	23/ 249		4.45	4.11	4.23	4.86
		_			for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	71/ 242		4.54	4.40	4.36	4.71
			structor provid			4	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	119/ 240		4.53	4.20	3.96	4.43
5. W	Vere re	quiremer	nts for lab rep	orts c.	learly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	27/ 217	4.58	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.86
				Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	utio	n										
Cred	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected G								Rea	asons	3			ТУ	pe			Majors	\$
00-	0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6						Rec	 guire	ed f	or Ma	 ajor		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	5
28-		5 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 3									J						5 -		
56-		1 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	6
		0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									J				-	
Gra	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1		here a		enoug	jh

Other

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Title

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	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		4.81	,	4.93	4.84	4.68		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
T - who we														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4 52	720/1400	1 (7	1 20	4 40	1 12	4 52
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	-	-	2	4			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		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		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		****/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		****/1256	3.91	3.88	4.30	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 788	2.67		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	1.0	0	0	^	1	^	^	2 00	****/ CO	****	****	4 40	4 70	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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	0.00	****/ 63	****		4.44	4.56	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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		****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****
J. Dia conferences neip you early out field activities	10	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	, 31			1.12	1.00	
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	***

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				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

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Ο	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		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		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		3.89	3.96	4.02	
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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				?	2						

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

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	Λ	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	4.43	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	4.52	4.12	4.20	4.27	4.63
	0	4	1	0	1	1	9	4.42			3.89	3.96	4.20	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	4	Т	U	Т	Τ	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	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	4 20	104/046	4 24	4 42	4 00	4 00	4 20
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	****
Frequ	once	. Dia	t wib.	1+101	2									
requ	гепсу	DIS	CLIDI	1CTOI	.1									

Credits Ea	Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	А	9	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-	_		
				2	0						

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 18

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

6

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

3

Questionnaires: 17

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 184 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew 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
		ctor make clear th		0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	843/1481	4.34	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.24
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect t	he 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 ot	her eval	uations reflect th	e 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 as	ssigned re	eadings 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 wr	ritten as:	signments contribu	te to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	898/1342	4.02	3.77	4.07	4.12	3.8
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly e	xplained	0	0	0	1	4	2	10	4.24	792/1459	4.16	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.2
8. How ma	any times	was class cancell	ed	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	4.93	4.84	4.68	4.65	5.0
9. How wo	ould 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	4.1
		Lecture															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures w	ell prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	529/1409	4.67	4.36	4.42	4.43	4.6
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem interest	ed in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	823/1407	4.77	4.54	4.69	4.67	4.7
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presented a	nd explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	773/1399	4.52	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.3
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to w	hat you learned	2	0	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	636/1400	4.56	4.14	4.27	4.28	4.4
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enhar	ce your understanding	2	5	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	945/1179	3.93	3.89	3.96	4.02	3.4
	Discussion																
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribute	to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	829/1262	3.78	3.70	4.05	4.14	3.8
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively encou	raged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1012/1259	4.01	4.00	4.29	4.34	3.8
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage fai	r and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1012/1256	3.91	3.88	4.30	4.34	3.8
4. Were s	special to	echniques successf	ul	11	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 788	2.67	3.82	4.00	4.07	***
		Laborator	У														
1. Did th	ne lab in	crease understandi	ng of the material	5	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	130/ 246	4.34	4.43	4.20	4.20	4.2
2. Were y	you provi	ded with adequate	background information	5	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	145/ 249	4.55	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.0
3. Were n	necessary	materials availab	le for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	168/ 242	4.51	4.54	4.40	4.36	4.2
4. Did th	ne lab in	structor provide a	ssistance	5	1	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	153/ 240	4.48	4.53	4.20	3.96	4.1
5. Were r	requireme	nts for lab report	s clearly specified	5	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	79/ 217	4.58	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.4
		Seminar															
	_	_	the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	***	****	4.49	4.70	* * *
2. Was th	ne instru	ctor available for	individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	* * *
3. Did re	esearch p	rojects contribute	to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	***
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	its Earned Cum. GPA Expected (						Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 A 5		Pe	anir	ed f	or Ma	 a ior		0	Graduat	 e	 0	 Majo		 11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99			100	-1 CTT.	-u -	J_ 1/10	⊥∪ر م	~	-	Siddudi	_	5	114 )	-	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99			Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	L7	Non-	-major	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49			GC.	c.a	-				J	onaci -g	Luu 1	- ,	14011		U
04-150	0	3.00-3.49	Б 0		_						_						

Electives

Other

0

17

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101 University of Maryland Title CELL BIOLOGY

Questionnaires: 99

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 185

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BLUMBERG, DAPHN (Instr. A) Spring 2006 Enrollment: 270

I

0

								_										
						Fr	eque	encie	s		Ins	tructo	r	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ra	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 54		General	- f b-i	0	^	1	2	1 -	27	ГЭ	4 20	700/	1 4 0 1	4 20	4 07	4.29	4 20	4.29
		lew insignts,skill uctor make clear t	s from this course	0	0	1	3 8	15 22	27 32	36	4.29	792/ 1070/			4.27 4.12	4.29	4.29	3.95
			the expected goals	1	0	1	13	23	31	30		1070/			4.12	4.23	4.23	3.78
		uations reflect t		0	75	3	13	43 6	5	3 U		****/			4.12	4.21	4.20	3.70
			e to what you learned	1	1	8	10	20	28	31	3.66				4.05	3.98	4.27	3.66
	-	_	ute to what you learned		87	1	1	3	20	4		****/			3.77	4.07	4.12	****
		g system clearly		2	1	6	7	21	20	42		1063/			4.09	4.16	4.17	3.89
	-	was class cancel	-	1	3	1	0	0	0	94	4.96				4.84	4.68	4.65	4.96
	_		teaching effectiveness		1	3	5	31	33			1209/			3.87	4.09	4.10	3.58
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor'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 th	e instru	ctor seem interes	ted 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 le	cture ma	terial 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 th	e lectur	es 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 au	diovisua	l techniques enha	nce your understanding	1	1	4	1	4	24	64	4.47	283/	1179	4.10	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.10
		Discussi																
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribut	e 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
			uraged to participate	73	0	7	2	6	5	6		1160/			4.00	4.29	4.34	3.04
		_	ir and open discussion	74	0	7	2	5	7	4		1177/			3.88	4.30	4.34	
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques success	ful	74	21	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/	788	****	3.82	4.00	4.07	****
		Laborato	-															
			<pre>ing of the material  background information</pre>	98	0	1 1	0	0	0	0		****/ ****/			4.43 4.45	4.20 4.11	4.20 4.23	****
		Seminar																
1 Were a	ssianed		o the announced theme	97	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****
		_	r individual attention	97	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,		****	****	4.53	4.66	****
			e to what you learned	97	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/	63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****
		Field Wo:	rk															
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribute	to what you learned	98	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	59	***	****	4.30	4.48	****
3. Was th	e instru	ctor available for	r consultation	98	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****
4. To wha	t degree	could you discus	s your evaluations	98	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry	out field activities	98	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****
		Self Pa																
			e to what you learned	98	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,	55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****
3. Were y	our cont	acts with the ins	tructor helpful	98	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****
			Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utic	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				R€	eason	ıs				Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2 A 39		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 Iajor	 s	0	 Gra	 duat	 e	1	 Мајо	 or	52
28-55	6		0 B 30			_			-		0							4=
56-83 84-150	27 21	2.00-2.99 1 3.00-3.49 2			Gei	nera	.1				0	Und	er-g	rad 9	98	Non-	-major	47
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 2			El	ecti	ves				0	###	# - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh
	_	2	P 0				~				•			es to k				, -
			т 0		O+1	hom					12	100	T. 0110	L				

Other

92

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101 University of Maryland Page 186 JUN 13, 2006 Title

CELL BIOLOGY Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. B) Spring 2006

Enrollment: 270

Ouestionnaires: 99

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 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 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 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 6 7 21 20 42 3.89 1063/1459 3.89 4.09 4.16 4.17 3.89 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 1.00 \*\*\*\* / 246 \*\*\*\* 4.43 4.20 4.20 \*\*\*\* 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 98 0 1 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 \*\*\*\* 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 63 \*\*\*\* 4.44 4.56 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 97 1 0 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 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 41 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.26 3.90 \*\*\*\* 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 98 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 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 55 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.55 4.88 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 98 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 51 \*\*\*\* 4.65 4.88 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Credits Earned \_\_\_\_\_\_ 0.00-0.99 2 A 39 A 39 B 30 C 16 Required for Majors 0 00 - 273 Graduate 1 Major 52 28-55 6 1.00-1.99 0 56-83 27 2.00-2.99 11 General 0 Under-grad 98 Non-major 47 3.00-3.49 22 D 1 84-150 21 F 0 Grad. 3.50-4.00 28 Electives #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 92 ?

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 0201 University of Maryland Title CELL BIOLOGY LAB Baltimore County Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN

Spring 2006

Page 187

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 76 Questionnaires: 70 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	 General															
1. Did you g	ain new insights,skills fro	m this course	1	0	0	2	12	21	34	4.26	831/1481	4.26	4.27	4.29	4.29	4.26
	nstructor make clear the ex		3	0	0	1	4	19	43	4.55	458/1481	4.55	4.12	4.23	4.23	4.55
	xam questions reflect the e		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 ex	pected goals	2	1	1	5	5	26	30	4.18	829/1424	4.18	4.05	4.21	4.27	4.18
5. Did assign	ned 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 writt	en assignments contribute t	o 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 g	rading system clearly expla	ined	4	0	1	3	6	11	45	4.45	535/1459	4.45	4.09	4.16	4.17	4.45
3. 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 teac	hing 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 in	nstructor seem interested i	n 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 lectu	re material presented and e	xplained clearly	13	0	0	0	4	14	39	4.61	445/1399	4.61	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.61
1. Did the le	ectures 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
. Did audio	visual techniques enhance y	our understanding	17	20	2	2	7	11	11	3.82	753/1179	3.82	3.89	3.96	4.02	3.82
	Discussion															
L. 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
. Were all	students actively encourage	d to participate	42	0	1	0	4	9	14	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.00	4.29	4.34	4.25
. Did the in	nstructor encourage fair an	d open discussion	42	0	1	1	4	9	13	4.14	837/1256	4.14	3.88	4.30	4.34	4.14
. Were spec	ial techniques successful	-	42	10	5	1	0	5	7	3.44	631/ 788	3.44	3.82	4.00	4.07	3.44
	Laboratory															
. Did the la	ab increase understanding o	f 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 back	ground information	34	0	0	0	2	5	29	4.75	40/ 249	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.75
. Were nece	ssary materials available f	or lab activities	33	0	0	0	1	8	28	4.73	69/ 242	4.73	4.54	4.40	4.36	4.73
. Did the la	ab instructor provide assis	tance	33	0	0	0	3	5	29	4.70	76/ 240	4.70	4.53	4.20	3.96	4.70
. Were requ	irements for lab reports cl	early specified	33	0	2	3	4	8	20	4.11	126/ 217	4.11	4.29	4.04	4.11	4.11
		Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earn	ed Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
	2 0.00-0.99 1	A 20		Red	quir	ea f	or M	ajor	S	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	40
	0 1.00-1.99 0	B 18		~		,				0	TT3		7.0			2.0
	8 2.00-2.99 5	C 6		Gei	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad 7	70	Non-	-major	30
84-150 1	==	D 0								0			1			1.
Grad.	3.50-4.00 10	F 0		Εle	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1				_	111
		P 0		0.1	ı				_	- 1	respons	es to b	e sign	uiicar	1t	
		I 0		Utl	her				5	51						
		? 2														

Title COMP. ANIMAL PHYSIOLOG

Instructor: VIANCOUR, TERRY

Enrollment: 202 Questionnaires: 116

ANCOUR, TERRY Spring 2006

Page 188 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------	--------------	---------------

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	10	25	77			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	,	4.27	4.12	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	10	1	./	7	11		****/1424	****	4.05	4.21	4.27	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	./	10	12	26	27	31		1065/1396	3.54	4.05	3.98		3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	82	Ι	5	5 25	7 28	13	3.84		3.84	3.77	4.07	4.12 4.17	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	5 1	∠5 0		48 111	3.96 4.97	1004/1459 211/1480	3.96 4.97	4.09 4.84	4.16 4.68		3.96 4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3 17	3	3	3	12	47	31	4.97	,			4.08	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Ι/	3	3	3	12	4/	31	4.04	014/1450	4.04	3.07	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		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 249	****	4.45	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	115	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	115	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	4.53	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	115	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	4.29	4.04	4.11	****
From		Dia	+ m i b											

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	26	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	88
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	33						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	14	C	24	General	0	Under-grad 11	15	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 t	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to b	be sig	nificant	
				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

				-	ncie		_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	Α	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	56
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	53	-		_	
				?	1						

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

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	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		1369/1481	3.35	4.12	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
<u> </u>														
Lecture	4	0	1	^	2	1 2	1.0	4 1 5	1000/1400	4 1 5	1 26	4 40	4 42	4 1 5
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	Τ	0	3	13	10		1098/1409	4.15	4.36	4.42	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	0	6	8	11		1307/1407	3.96	4.54	4.69	4.67	3.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4 4	0	3	1 6	5	, 5	11 9		1140/1399 1235/1400	3.81 3.48	4.12 4.14	4.26 4.27	4.27 4.28	3.81 3.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	5	0	0	7	9	3.40		3.40	3.89		4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Э	1	5	U	8	/	5	3.28	989/11/9	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	, 00	****	****	4.49	4.70	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	***

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	25			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: BIOL 397W 0101

2

SCIENTIFIC WRITING

Discussion

PORTER, JANE P.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 1

Page 191 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

		Fre	quer	ncies	Instructor			actor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect		
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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

1. Did class discussions contribute to w	hat 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

5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1179 5.00 3.89 3.96 4.02 5.00

# 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1256 5.00 3.88 4.30 4.34 5.00

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

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

			Frequencies 1 2 3 4 5			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		1237/1481	3.70	4.12	4.23	4.32	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	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		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			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		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	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	6	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 420A 0101 University of Maryl Title Baltimore County Instructor: KLOETZEL, JOHN Spring 2006

I

?

0

1

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 14

18

University of Maryland Page 193
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

					Frequencies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	957/1481	4.15	4.27	4.29	4.45	4.15
_	-	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	971/1481	4.07	4.12	4.23	4.32	4.07
		uestions reflec		-	0	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	865/1249	4.07	4.12	4.27	4.44	4.07
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	784/1424	4.21	4.05	4.21	4.35	4.21
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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
				o 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 th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	4	0	2	4	1	3	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.09	4.16	4.25	3.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1288/1480	4.15	4.84	4.68	4.74	4.15
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	494/1450	4.38	3.87	4.09	4.28	4.38
		Lectur	0															
1 Were t	he instr	actor's lecture	_	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	727/1409	4.54	4.36	4.42	4.51	4.54
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.79	5.00
		xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.12	4.26	4.36	4.33		
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	561/1400	4.54	4.14	4.27	4.38	4.54
				our understanding	1	0	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	732/1179	3.85	3.89	3.96		3.85
ו הנת ו		Discus			10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	++++/1000	****	3.70	4 05	4 22	****
				what you learned	12	0	•	0	0	2	0		****/1262 ****/1259	****	4.00	4.05	4.33	****
				d to participate	12 12	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/1259		3.88	4.29	4.57	****
		ctor encourage echniques succe		d open discussion	12	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 788		3.88	4.30	4.60	****
1	PCOLUL O	Joinit queb Buode	22141			_	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	,		3.02	1.00	1.20	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad						es Reasons Ty				Ту	pe			Majors	\$		
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5						 quire		 >∞ M			2	Graduat		0	Majo		9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		rec	4urr,	=u 10	J⊥ IM	a jui	D	4	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC	) <u>T</u>	פ
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				3	Under-q	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0						-	2			5	-			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 1									respons				_	
	P I												_		_			

Other

Course-Section: BIOL 420B 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Instructor: MCGRAW, PATRICI Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Page 194

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	18	
Questionnaires:	14	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		Genera	L															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	1	3	5	5		1069/1481		4.27	4.29	4.45	4.00
		ctor make clear	_	_	0	0	0	2	2	6	4		1148/1481		4.12	4.23	4.32	3.86
	_	uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	2	8	4		824/1249			4.27	4.44	
		uations reflect			0	1	1	0	3	3	6		959/1424		4.05	4.21	4.35	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	5		707/1396		4.05	3.98	4.09	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	6		649/1342		3.77	4.07	4.21	
		g system clearly		ined	0	1	1	2	3	3			1247/1459			4.16		3.54
		was class cance			0	0	1	3	5	4			1466/1480				4.74	3.07
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	3.87	4.09	4.28	3.75
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	s well p	prepared	1	0	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1265/1409	3.69	4.36	4.42	4.51	3.69
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested ir	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 le	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						1	2	2	6	3	3.57	1223/1399	3.57	4.12	4.26	4.36	3.57
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned	0	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1211/1400	3.57	4.14	4.27	4.38	3.57
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	0	3	0	3	2	2	4	3.64	850/1179	3.64	3.89	3.96	4.07	3.64
		Discus	ni on															
1 Did al	and diam			what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	816/1262	3.88	3.70	4.05	4.33	3.88
				to participate	6	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	783/1259		4.00	4.03	4.57	4.25
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	4				3.88	4.30	4.60	
		echniques succes		open discussion	6	1	1	0	2	3 1		3.71	,			4.00		3.71
4. Were S	врестат се	ecinitques succes	SSLUI		0	1	1	U	4	1	3	3.71	340/ /00	3.71	3.02	4.00	4.20	3./1
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	atio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	s Reasons					Ту	pe			Majors	3			
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8					Red	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 5	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3						J						5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	-major	7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00					ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
	-			P 0						<pre>#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant</pre>								
				I O		Ot.1	her					8			3			
				? 1	001101				-									
				I 0		Otl	her					8	responses to be significant					

Course-Section: BIOL 428 0101 University of Maryland Title COMPUTER APPL MOLEC BI Instructor: ONEILL, MICHAEL

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

O +	a	Evaluation	O	

Page 195

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies Instructo			ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	_	0	^	0	1	2	2	4 00	005/1401	4 00	4 07	4 00	4 45	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	Ţ	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		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	Τ	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		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		3.77	4.07	4.21	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	2	2		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														
	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2 71	1261/1409	3.71	4.36	4.42	4.51	3.71
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	7		1168/1407	4.43	4.54	4.69	4.79	4.43
	-	0			0	4	3		,					
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	-	0	0	3	3	Τ		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	Τ	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	Τ	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
			.,											
Frequ	lency	Dist	rib	utio	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	0						

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

			Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	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
. 3														
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		****/ 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	****
		0	0	1	0	-	-		,	++++	++++			****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	U	U	Τ	U	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		****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
1. Hab the recapacity factoring by proceeds herpfur	10	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	, 54			1.05	5.00	

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	6						

Course-Section: BIOL 434 0101 University of Maryland Page 197 Title MICROBIAL MOLEC GENETI Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006

Instructor: WOLF, RICHARD E

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 23

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Ο	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		4.12	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	•					_			0.4.5.4.4.0.0					
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	Τ	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		****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.26	****
<u></u>	Ū		,	,	_	_	_	25	, , , , , ,		2.02		20	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	3	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 444 0101 University of Maryland Title DEVELOPMENT AND CANCER

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 18

BIEBERICH, CHAR

Instructor:

- ·			
Student.	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 198

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		4.05	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		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
J. non nouse you grade one overest todoming erroctiveness		Ü	Ü	Ü	ŭ				100/1100		5.07	1.05	1.20	
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	****
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıt.i.or	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	3	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 456 0101 University of Maryland
Title PLANT MOLECULAR BIOLOG Baltimore County
Instructor: MILLER, STEPHEN Spring 2006

Ρ

I

0

0

2

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

21

University of Maryland Page 199
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

9

responses to be significant

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		om 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	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected 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	e exam q	uestions reflect	the e	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 oth	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	109/1424	4.93	4.05	4.21	4.35	4.93
5. Did ass	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	12	4.92	65/1396	4.92	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.92
6. Did wr	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	4	9	4.57	257/1342	4.57	3.77	4.07	4.21	4.57
7. Was the	7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	0	0	2	12	4.86	131/1459	4.86	4.09	4.16	4.25	4.86
8. How man	8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1245/1480	4.21	4.84	4.68	4.74	4.21
9. How wor	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes						0	0	0	1	11	4.92	89/1450	4.92	3.87	4.09	4.28	4.92
1 Word +1	ho inatr	Lecture		propared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.36	4.42	4.51	5.00
	<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> <li>Did the instructor seem interested in the subject</li> </ol>					0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.79	5.00
				explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	178/1399	4.85	4.12	4.26	4.79	4.85
		es contribute to			Ω	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	385/1400	4.69	4.14	4.27	4.38	4.69
				your understanding	8	2	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	108/1179	4.82	3.89	3.96	4.07	
J. Dia aa	aiovibaa.	r cccimitques cin	iance j	your understanding	O	2	O	O	_	O	10	1.02	100/11/2	1.02	3.05	3.50	1.07	1.02
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite 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 a	ll stude	nts actively end	courage	ed 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	e instru	ctor encourage i	fair ar	nd 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 sp	pecial to	echniques succes	ssful		11	2	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	291/ 788	4.25	3.82	4.00	4.26	4.25
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ation	า									
				-	-													
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for M					 ajor	s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0									3					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 4				4	Under-g	rad 2	:1	Non-	-major	9			
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives					0	#### - 1	Means t		re not	enoug	ıh		

Other

Course-Section: BIOL 457 0101 University of Maryland PHYS:MARINE/EST ANIMAL Baltimore County

Page 200 JUN 13, 2006 Title Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029 CRONIN, THOMAS Instructor:

Ouestionnaires: 6 Student Course Evalu
--

Enrollment:

6

			Frequencie				Ins		ructor	Course Dep		pt UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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			0	0	0	3	2		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		810/1249		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		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	Λ	Ω	Λ	Λ	0	Ω	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		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		910/1399		4.12	4.26	4.36	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6		1/1400		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	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	ıtioı	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				2	Ο						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Course-Section: BIOL 476 0101

23

ANTIBOTICS

LOVETT, PAUL S

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

Page 201 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

_			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

	Ouestions				MP	NA	Fr 1	_	quencie: 2 3			Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean			
		Quescion								4 								
		Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om 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 th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	3	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	603/1481	4.45	4.12	4.23	4.32	4.45
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	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 ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	3	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	807/1424	4.20	4.05	4.21	4.35	4.20
5. Did as	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	419/1396	4.35	4.05	3.98	4.09	4.35
6. Did wr	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned					2	0	0	5	7	6	4.06	725/1342	4.06	3.77	4.07	4.21	4.06
7. Was th	7. Was the grading system clearly explained					0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	827/1459	4.20	4.09	4.16	4.25	4.20
8. How ma	8. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.84	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How wo	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes					0	0	0	7	6	3	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	3.87	4.09	4.28	3.75
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	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 le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	783/1399	4.30	4.12	4.26	4.36	4.30
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o 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 au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	4	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	860/1179	3.60	3.89	3.96	4.07	3.60
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed 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 th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd 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 s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		15	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 788	****	3.82	4.00	4.26	****
				Frequ	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	 0.00-0.99	0	 А б				ed f	 or M	 a ior		n	Graduat		0	 Majo		16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 8		1/6/	Jull	ca I	Ο± 1•1	۱۰ د م	_	J	Graduat	_	0	1.100 ) (	-	10
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C 2		Ger	nera	1				5	Under-g	rad 2	23	Non-	major	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	General				-	onaci g	2		1,011		,			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves			0 #### - Means there a		here a	re not	enous	rh		
oraa.	Ü	3.33 1.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		Ot1	her				1	.2	_		3			

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101

Title SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS

LINDAHL, LASSE Instructor:

Enrollment:

12 Questionnaires: 11 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 202 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Studen	t Course	Evalua	ation	Quest:	ionna:	ire
--------	----------	--------	-------	--------	--------	-----

	Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1														
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		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		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		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		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		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	- ,	4.90	4.84	4.68		4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	3	0		1098/1450		3.87	4.09		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
- 1														
Laboratory	1.0	0	0	•	0	0	-	F 00		****	4 42	4 00	4 45	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ		****/ 246	****	4.43	4.20	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10 10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 249 ****/ 242	****	4.45	4.11	3.87	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	0		-	1	0		****/ 242	****	4.54	4.40	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10 10	0	0	0	0	U T	1		****/ 217	****	4.53	4.20	4.43	****
5. were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	~~~/ 21/		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		****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.49	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned		0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10 10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.10	****
		-	-	-	_	-	-		, 33					
<u> </u>														

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