

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	5	12	33	63	91	4.09	1060/1522	4.09	4.29	4.30	4.14	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	10	32	67	92	4.15	976/1522	4.15	4.11	4.26	4.18	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	7	15	21	59	102	4.15	849/1285	4.15	4.01	4.30	4.22	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	20	4	10	38	63	69	3.99	1020/1476	3.99	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.99	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	6	5	26	57	105	4.26	566/1412	4.26	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	57	7	14	33	46	45	3.74	1052/1381	3.74	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	14	36	66	84	4.07	956/1500	4.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	5	195	4.97	146/1517	4.98	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	36	4	3	6	38	84	35	3.86	1073/1497	3.86	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	4	6	36	153	4.66	604/1440	4.66	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	0	4	30	167	4.77	821/1448	4.77	4.64	4.71	4.63	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	11	27	78	82	4.12	995/1436	4.12	4.18	4.29	4.24	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	9	12	21	67	92	4.10	995/1432	4.10	4.18	4.29	4.23	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	9	5	32	54	97	4.14	540/1221	4.14	4.08	3.93	3.86	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	9	22	24	66	72	3.88	834/1280	3.88	4.09	4.10	3.92	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	5	3	24	53	108	4.33	751/1277	4.33	4.35	4.34	4.13	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	5	5	32	45	106	4.25	777/1269	4.25	4.35	4.31	4.04	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	8	9	30	70	74	4.01	424/ 854	4.01	3.94	4.02	3.87	4.01	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	191	7	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	194	0	2	1	4	1	4	3.33	****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	196	3	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	194	5	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	195	4	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	193	5	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	195	4	2	2	0	3	0	2.57	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	195	4	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	195	2	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	196	1	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	196	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	197	0	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	197	3	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	197	2	2	3	1	1	0	2.14	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	197	2	2	2	0	3	0	2.57	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	193	0	2	3	2	2	4	3.23	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	193	0	2	2	2	3	4	3.38	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	193	3	2	2	3	0	3	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	193	2	1	3	3	1	3	3.18	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	194	2	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL
 Enrollment: 288
 Questionnaires: 206

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 137
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	89	0.00-0.99	1	A	99	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	58
28-55	41	1.00-1.99	5	B	65						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	30	C	26	General	1	Under-grad	206	Non-major	148
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	27	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	60	F	1	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	174				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHIL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 138
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.29	4.30	4.14	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	824/1522	4.30	4.11	4.26	4.18	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	405/1285	4.63	4.01	4.30	4.22	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.09	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	137/1412	4.80	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	663/1381	4.20	3.83	4.08	3.93	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	839/1500	4.20	4.09	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	534/1497	4.30	3.96	4.11	4.02	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	304/1440	4.70	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	793/1436	4.45	4.18	4.29	4.24	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	454/1432	4.62	4.18	4.29	4.23	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	213/1221	4.43	4.08	3.93	3.86	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	477/1280	4.40	4.09	4.10	3.92	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	527/1277	4.60	4.35	4.34	4.13	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.35	4.31	4.04	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	407/ 854	4.11	3.94	4.02	3.87	4.11	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 139
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.29	4.30	4.14	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	824/1522	4.30	4.11	4.26	4.18	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	405/1285	4.63	4.01	4.30	4.22	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.09	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	137/1412	4.80	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	663/1381	4.20	3.83	4.08	3.93	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	839/1500	4.20	4.09	4.18	4.16	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	685/1497	4.30	3.96	4.11	4.02	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	716/1440	4.70	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	514/1436	4.45	4.18	4.29	4.24	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	558/1432	4.62	4.18	4.29	4.23	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	461/1221	4.43	4.08	3.93	3.86	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	477/1280	4.40	4.09	4.10	3.92	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	527/1277	4.60	4.35	4.34	4.13	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.35	4.31	4.04	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	407/ 854	4.11	3.94	4.02	3.87	4.11	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 140
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	3	4	4	3.43	1433/1522	3.43	4.29	4.30	4.14	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	2	3	4	3.36	1415/1522	3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	3.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	2	1	4	2	2.85	1265/1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	2.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1115/1476	3.44	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	892/1412	3.68	4.06	4.06	4.01	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	4	1	3	3.08	1281/1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	2	1	5	3.55	1283/1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1080/1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	2	2	3	0	1	2.50	1476/1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	2.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1100/1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	1258/1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1212/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	0	3	5	3.58	1248/1432	3.29	4.18	4.29	4.23	3.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	0	3	1	5	3.64	846/1221	3.65	4.08	3.93	3.86	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1277	1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	183/ 215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.89	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	160/ 228	3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	177/ 217	3.96	4.48	4.51	4.51	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	173/ 216	3.71	4.41	4.42	4.41	4.10	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	171/ 205	3.70	4.30	4.23	4.28	3.78	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 79	2.00	2.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	1.50	1.50	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	1.00	1.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	1.00	1.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	4.00	4.25	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	4.00	4.67	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 23	3.00	3.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 140
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 141
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	7	7	5	3.80	1269/1522	3.43	4.29	4.30	4.14	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	4	3	6	6	3.60	1323/1522	3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	3	6	1	5	2.90	1264/1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	2.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	3	1	8	5	3.45	1336/1476	3.44	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	688/1412	3.68	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	2	5	7	3.63	1113/1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	2	1	7	6	3.58	1272/1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	11	8	8	4.42	1144/1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	2	7	5	2	3.29	1358/1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	1007/1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	3	3	5	9	4.00	1353/1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	7	8	4.05	1029/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	5	6	6	3.70	1212/1432	3.29	4.18	4.29	4.23	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	9	7	3	3.60	860/1221	3.65	4.08	3.93	3.86	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1277	1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	2	4	4	7	3.63	197/ 215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.63	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	174/ 228	3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	4.05	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	175/ 217	3.96	4.48	4.51	4.51	4.21	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	3	1	4	2	8	3.61	191/ 216	3.71	4.41	4.42	4.41	3.61	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	0	2	7	8	4.00	141/ 205	3.70	4.30	4.23	4.28	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	2.00	2.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	1.50	1.50	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.49	3.85	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0104
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 142
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	9	7	3	3.45	1421/1522	3.43	4.29	4.30	4.14	3.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	3	9	3	3.27	1435/1522	3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	3.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	6	9	0	3.00	1248/1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	5	9	3	3.52	1315/1476	3.44	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	4	6	7	3.85	932/1412	3.68	4.06	4.06	4.01	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	6	6	4	3.45	1175/1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	6	5	4	3.24	1399/1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	3.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1193/1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	7	2	7	2	1	2.37	1482/1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	2.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	5	6	7	3.90	1252/1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	2	4	4	7	3.63	1414/1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	3.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	6	7	3	3.45	1298/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	3.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	8	6	0	2.95	1374/1432	3.29	4.18	4.29	4.23	2.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	2	6	3	5	3.39	963/1221	3.65	4.08	3.93	3.86	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/1277	1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	****/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	177/ 215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.94	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	2	3	7	4	3.65	211/ 228	3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	3.65	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	1	5	4	8	3.89	202/ 217	3.96	4.48	4.51	4.51	3.89	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	2	1	7	7	3.79	185/ 216	3.71	4.41	4.42	4.41	3.79	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	172/ 205	3.70	4.30	4.23	4.28	3.76	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	2.00	2.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	1.50	1.50	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	1.00	1.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	1.00	1.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	4.00	4.25	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	4.00	4.67	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 23	3.00	3.00	4.41	4.19	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0104
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 142
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0105
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 143
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1122/1522	3.43	4.29	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1458/1522	3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	3.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1236/1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	3.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	1349/1476	3.44	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	430/1412	3.68	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	806/1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1475/1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	2.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1301/1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1204/1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1094/1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1319/1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1315/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1305/1432	3.29	4.18	4.29	4.23	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	860/1221	3.65	4.08	3.93	3.86	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	89/ 215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	154/ 228	3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	170/ 217	3.96	4.48	4.51	4.51	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	174/ 216	3.71	4.41	4.42	4.41	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	108/ 205	3.70	4.30	4.23	4.28	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1489/1522	3.43	4.29	4.30	4.14	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1365/1522	3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1248/1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1380/1476	3.44	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1385/1412	3.68	4.06	4.06	4.01	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1350/1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	1481/1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	2.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	802/1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1370/1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1186/1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1402/1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1212/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	1414/1432	3.29	4.18	4.29	4.23	2.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	899/1221	3.65	4.08	3.93	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1277/1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	1.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1276/1277	1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	1.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	215/ 215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	2.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	214/ 228	3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	216/ 217	3.96	4.48	4.51	4.51	2.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	203/ 216	3.71	4.41	4.42	4.41	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	203/ 205	3.70	4.30	4.23	4.28	2.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	79/ 79	2.00	2.00	4.58	4.13	2.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	77/ 77	1.50	1.50	4.52	4.03	1.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	64/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.49	3.85	1.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	78/ 78	1.00	1.00	4.45	3.88	1.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	80/ 80	1.00	1.00	4.11	3.79	1.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 47	4.00	4.25	4.41	3.90	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	40/ 45	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.90	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	31/ 37	4.00	4.67	4.63	4.53	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	21/ 23	3.00	3.00	4.41	4.19	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	4	
?	0			

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0203
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 145
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	8	5	4	3.76	1289/1522	3.43	4.29	4.30	4.14	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	6	6	5	3.94	1146/1522	3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	9	7	0	1	2.59	1271/1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	2.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	2	6	6	3	3.59	1289/1476	3.44	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	7	3	6	3.82	956/1412	3.68	4.06	4.06	4.01	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	6	7	3	3.71	1076/1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	2	7	4	2	3.12	1420/1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	3.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1104/1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	10	6	1	3.47	1291/1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	1031/1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	1249/1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1029/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1036/1432	3.29	4.18	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	659/1221	3.65	4.08	3.93	3.86	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	4	7	3	3.93	180/ 215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.93	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	178/ 228	3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	169/ 217	3.96	4.48	4.51	4.51	4.27	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	1	1	5	3	4	3.57	193/ 216	3.71	4.41	4.42	4.41	3.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	6	3	5	3.93	161/ 205	3.70	4.30	4.23	4.28	3.93	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	2.00	2.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	1.50	1.50	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	1.00	1.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	1.00	1.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	4.00	4.67	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 23	3.00	3.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 0 Under-grad 21 Non-major 18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	2	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P	0			
				I	0	Other	12	
				?	1			

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0207
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 146
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	5	2	1	2.57	1508/1522	3.43	4.29	4.30	4.14	2.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	2	2	3	1	2.46	1510/1522	3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	2.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	5	1	1	2.43	1274/1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	2.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	2	3	1	3	2.77	1447/1476	3.44	4.02	4.22	4.09	2.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	5	2	3.36	1248/1412	3.68	4.06	4.06	4.01	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	6	1	4	0	2.43	1359/1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	2.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	1	5	3	3.43	1345/1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1019/1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	1	8	1	1	2.85	1445/1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	2.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	1063/1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1353/1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	6	2	3	3.38	1320/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	6	2	1	2.85	1386/1432	3.29	4.18	4.29	4.23	2.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	832/1221	3.65	4.08	3.93	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	1	2	2	4	3.45	204/ 215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	3	1	3	4	3.73	206/ 228	3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	3.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	200/ 217	3.96	4.48	4.51	4.51	3.92	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	186/ 216	3.71	4.41	4.42	4.41	3.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	3	2	3	3.45	188/ 205	3.70	4.30	4.23	4.28	3.45	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0209
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 147
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	4	5	6	3.38	1444/1522	3.43	4.29	4.30	4.14	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	6	6	3.62	1319/1522	3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	6	3	4	3.05	1244/1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	3.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	9	4	3.65	1251/1476	3.44	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	6	2	4	7	3.50	1165/1412	3.68	4.06	4.06	4.01	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	3	5	6	3.58	1136/1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	7	2	5	3	3.00	1430/1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	1161/1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	4	10	0	3.22	1379/1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	3	12	4.30	1007/1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	4	4	11	4.14	1332/1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	4	4	8	3.80	1197/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	3	8	3.60	1243/1432	3.29	4.18	4.29	4.23	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	1	2	3	10	3.84	733/1221	3.65	4.08	3.93	3.86	3.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1277	1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	162/ 215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.06	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	202/ 228	3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	3.81	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	162/ 217	3.96	4.48	4.51	4.51	4.31	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	184/ 216	3.71	4.41	4.42	4.41	3.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	173/ 205	3.70	4.30	4.23	4.28	3.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	2.00	2.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	1.50	1.50	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 78	1.00	1.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 80	1.00	1.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	4.00	4.25	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	4	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	10	
?	1			

Course-Section: BIOL 123 0101
 Title HUMAN GENETICS
 Instructor: GLASER, FREDA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 148
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	1171/1522	3.95	4.29	4.30	4.14	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	6	9	3.95	1135/1522	3.95	4.11	4.26	4.18	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	2	8	8	3.90	1027/1285	3.90	4.01	4.30	4.22	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	6	7	5	3.62	1275/1476	3.62	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	3	6	6	2	3.28	1281/1412	3.28	4.06	4.06	4.01	3.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	6	5	6	3.60	1130/1381	3.60	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	9	7	3.86	1117/1500	3.86	4.09	4.18	4.16	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	1019/1517	4.57	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	6	4	3	3.47	1296/1497	3.47	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	8	11	4.33	984/1440	4.33	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	1097/1448	4.57	4.64	4.71	4.63	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	7	8	3.95	1107/1436	3.95	4.18	4.29	4.24	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	963/1432	4.14	4.18	4.29	4.23	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	0	2	7	9	4.05	589/1221	4.05	4.08	3.93	3.86	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	4	5	3	3.57	1000/1280	3.57	4.09	4.10	3.92	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	781/1277	4.29	4.35	4.34	4.13	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	707/1269	4.36	4.35	4.31	4.04	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	551/ 854	3.85	3.94	4.02	3.87	3.85	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 2	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 3	D 2		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

Course-Section: BIOL 233 0101
 Title NUTRITION AND HEALTH
 Instructor: WELCH, G.
 Enrollment: 74
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 149
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	8	21	32	4.25	899/1522	4.25	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	15	13	30	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	5	12	18	27	3.98	955/1285	3.98	4.01	4.30	4.36	3.98	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	41	1	2	3	6	11	4.04	987/1476	4.04	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	0	10	11	38	4.31	520/1412	4.31	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	48	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	****/1381	****	3.83	4.08	3.97	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	7	14	38	4.31	720/1500	4.31	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	38	24	4.39	1177/1517	4.39	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.39	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	4	15	31	8	3.74	1153/1497	3.74	3.96	4.11	4.11	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	5	7	18	31	4.23	1071/1440	4.23	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	8	50	4.77	821/1448	4.77	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	4	8	16	32	4.21	916/1436	4.21	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	5	7	12	35	4.20	928/1432	4.20	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	41	5	1	5	3	3	2.88	1110/1221	2.88	4.08	3.93	4.02	2.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	3	0	5	4	9	3.76	900/1280	3.76	4.09	4.10	4.08	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	1	1	2	2	16	4.41	692/1277	4.41	4.35	4.34	4.33	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	763/1269	4.27	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	43	17	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	63	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 233 0101
 Title NUTRITION AND HEALTH
 Instructor: WELCH, G.
 Enrollment: 74
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 149
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	30						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	7	Under-grad	65	Non-major	57
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	16	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	47				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 252 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 114
 Questionnaires: 88

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 150
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	6	80	4.86	204/1522	4.86	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	20	64	4.66	371/1522	4.66	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	28	55	4.55	488/1285	4.55	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	54	2	0	1	6	25	4.53	454/1476	4.53	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	6	19	57	4.58	299/1412	4.58	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	62	0	1	1	6	18	4.58	272/1381	4.58	3.83	4.08	3.97	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	11	72	4.73	242/1500	4.73	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	6	79	4.91	487/1517	4.91	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	4	21	53	4.58	326/1497	4.58	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	12	72	4.78	392/1440	4.78	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	4	82	4.92	444/1448	4.92	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	2	21	59	4.60	478/1436	4.60	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	7	77	4.82	280/1432	4.82	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	30	3	4	2	14	30	4.21	493/1221	4.21	4.08	3.93	4.02	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	2	1	1	4	13	4.19	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.08	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	2	0	0	3	16	4.48	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.33	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	68	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	68	16	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	81	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	81	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	81	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	81	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	81	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	86	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	87	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	87	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 252 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 114
 Questionnaires: 88

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 150
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 29	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 0	B 39		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 5	C 8	General 7	Under-grad 88 Non-major 78
84-150	26	3.00-3.49 25	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 20	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 5	Other 67	

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 151
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1522	4.73	4.29	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	157/1522	4.61	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	181/1285	4.33	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	597/1476	4.02	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	155/1412	4.59	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	6	9	3.95	872/1381	3.05	3.83	4.08	3.97	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	154/1500	4.73	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	577/1517	4.68	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	129/1497	4.40	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	192/1440	4.39	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1448	4.95	4.64	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	263/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1432	4.69	4.18	4.29	4.31	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	156/1221	3.56	4.08	3.93	4.02	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	677/1280	3.56	4.09	4.10	4.08	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	470/1277	4.33	4.35	4.34	4.33	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	547/1269	3.78	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	426/ 854	2.50	3.94	4.02	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	42/ 215	4.70	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.81	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	34/ 228	4.91	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.81	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	24/ 217	4.48	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.94	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	45/ 216	4.74	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	7	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	22/ 205	4.78	4.30	4.23	4.37	4.89	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 151
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0201
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 152
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1122/1522	4.73	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1080/1522	4.61	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1248/1285	4.33	4.01	4.30	4.36	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1467/1476	4.02	4.02	4.22	4.20	2.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	760/1412	4.59	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1370/1381	3.05	3.83	4.08	3.97	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	988/1500	4.73	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.68	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1404/1440	4.39	4.44	4.45	4.42	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	4.95	4.64	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1056/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1036/1432	4.69	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1197/1221	3.56	4.08	3.93	4.02	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1187/1280	3.56	4.09	4.10	4.08	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	930/1277	4.33	4.35	4.34	4.33	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1207/1269	3.78	4.35	4.31	4.33	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	854/ 854	2.50	3.94	4.02	4.00	1.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	168/ 215	4.70	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 228	4.91	4.47	4.35	4.56	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	211/ 217	4.48	4.48	4.51	4.57	3.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	174/ 216	4.74	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 153
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	246/1522	4.73	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	255/1522	4.61	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	425/1285	4.33	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	473/1476	4.02	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	231/1412	4.59	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	4	4	5	1	2.94	1307/1381	3.05	3.83	4.08	3.97	2.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	65/1500	4.73	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	767/1517	4.68	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	272/1497	4.40	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	492/1440	4.39	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	602/1448	4.95	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	415/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	502/1432	4.69	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	11	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1221	3.56	4.08	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1280	3.56	4.09	4.10	4.08	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1277	4.33	4.35	4.34	4.33	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1269	3.78	4.35	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	2.50	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	41/ 215	4.70	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.82	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	29/ 228	4.91	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	71/ 217	4.48	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	43/ 216	4.74	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	8	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	46/ 205	4.78	4.30	4.23	4.37	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 153
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 154
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	246/1522	4.73	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	255/1522	4.61	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	425/1285	4.33	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	473/1476	4.02	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	231/1412	4.59	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	4	4	5	1	2.94	1307/1381	3.05	3.83	4.08	3.97	2.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	65/1500	4.73	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	767/1517	4.68	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	859/1497	4.40	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	272/1440	4.39	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	395/1448	4.95	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	170/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	129/1432	4.69	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	10	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1221	3.56	4.08	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1280	3.56	4.09	4.10	4.08	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1277	4.33	4.35	4.34	4.33	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1269	3.78	4.35	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	2.50	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	41/ 215	4.70	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.82	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	29/ 228	4.91	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	71/ 217	4.48	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	43/ 216	4.74	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	8	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	46/ 205	4.78	4.30	4.23	4.37	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 154
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 21 Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 155
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	246/1522	4.73	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	255/1522	4.61	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	425/1285	4.33	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	473/1476	4.02	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	231/1412	4.59	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	4	4	5	1	2.94	1307/1381	3.05	3.83	4.08	3.97	2.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	65/1500	4.73	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	767/1517	4.68	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	5	5	2	3.43	1315/1497	4.40	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	1155/1440	4.39	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.95	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	708/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	548/1432	4.69	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1221	3.56	4.08	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1280	3.56	4.09	4.10	4.08	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1277	4.33	4.35	4.34	4.33	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1269	3.78	4.35	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	2.50	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	41/ 215	4.70	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.82	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	29/ 228	4.91	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	71/ 217	4.48	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	43/ 216	4.74	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	8	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	46/ 205	4.78	4.30	4.23	4.37	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 155
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0401
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 156
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1522	4.73	4.29	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	511/1522	4.61	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	706/1285	4.33	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	838/1476	4.02	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	149/1412	4.59	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	8	1	3.53	1145/1381	3.05	3.83	4.08	3.97	3.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	252/1500	4.73	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	577/1517	4.68	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1497	4.40	3.96	4.11	4.11	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	452/1440	4.39	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1448	4.95	4.64	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	295/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1432	4.69	4.18	4.29	4.31	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	606/1221	3.56	4.08	3.93	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1280	3.56	4.09	4.10	4.08	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	4.33	4.35	4.34	4.33	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	3.78	4.35	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 854	2.50	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	31/ 215	4.70	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.90	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 228	4.91	4.47	4.35	4.56	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	85/ 217	4.48	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	40/ 216	4.74	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 205	4.78	4.30	4.23	4.37	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: BIOL 275 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 188
 Questionnaires: 96

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 157
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	2	12	30	47	4.30	849/1522	4.30	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	2	5	30	28	27	3.79	1248/1522	3.79	4.11	4.26	4.29	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	3	6	22	32	29	3.85	1049/1285	3.85	4.01	4.30	4.36	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	56	3	4	9	10	10	3.56	1302/1476	3.56	4.02	4.22	4.20	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	4	6	17	21	37	3.95	826/1412	3.95	4.06	4.06	4.00	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	68	2	2	2	10	7	3.78	****/1381	****	3.83	4.08	3.97	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	12	14	28	37	3.96	1038/1500	3.96	4.09	4.18	4.20	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	4	86	4.96	244/1517	4.96	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	1	4	29	26	18	3.72	1174/1497	3.72	3.96	4.11	4.11	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	6	5	23	57	4.44	891/1440	4.44	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	4	5	19	63	4.55	1123/1448	4.55	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	8	27	25	29	3.81	1193/1436	3.81	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	3	11	29	43	4.12	977/1432	4.12	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	5	4	17	23	34	3.93	677/1221	3.93	4.08	3.93	4.02	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	75	0	1	3	4	5	8	3.76	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.08	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	75	0	1	0	2	4	14	4.43	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.33	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	75	0	0	2	1	8	10	4.24	****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	75	11	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	93	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.62	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	93	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.56	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	93	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	93	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	93	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	4.37	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	32						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	12	C	29	General	11	Under-grad	96	Non-major	73
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	16	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	61				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 158
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	290/1522	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	623/1522	4.34	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	347/1285	4.42	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	473/1476	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	6	2	11	4.26	557/1412	4.07	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	482/1381	4.08	3.83	4.08	3.97	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	5	11	4.09	940/1500	3.75	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	767/1517	4.77	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	654/1497	4.19	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	432/1440	4.52	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	765/1448	4.69	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	845/1436	4.06	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	732/1432	4.32	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	461/1221	4.32	4.08	3.93	4.02	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	677/1280	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.08	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1020/1277	4.15	4.35	4.34	4.33	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	875/1269	4.17	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	287/ 854	4.15	3.94	4.02	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	52/ 215	4.56	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.74	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	58/ 228	4.48	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.68	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	37/ 217	4.68	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.89	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	118/ 216	4.45	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.53	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	2	1	4	11	4.16	128/ 205	4.02	4.30	4.23	4.37	4.16	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	4.50	4.25	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 158
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0201
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 159
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	605/1522	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	4	4.17	965/1522	4.34	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	566/1285	4.42	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	4	4.06	982/1476	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	1	6	5	3.69	1065/1412	4.07	4.06	4.06	4.00	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	2	7	5	3.82	1000/1381	4.08	3.83	4.08	3.97	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	4	5	3	3.22	1401/1500	3.75	4.09	4.18	4.20	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	855/1517	4.77	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	421/1497	4.19	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	604/1440	4.52	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1448	4.69	4.64	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	906/1436	4.06	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	514/1432	4.32	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	279/1221	4.32	4.08	3.93	4.02	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	677/1280	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.08	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1020/1277	4.15	4.35	4.34	4.33	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	798/1269	4.17	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	166/ 854	4.15	3.94	4.02	4.00	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	89/ 215	4.56	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	148/ 228	4.48	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	46/ 217	4.68	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	95/ 216	4.45	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	104/ 205	4.02	4.30	4.23	4.37	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0301
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 160
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	414/1522	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	654/1522	4.34	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	722/1285	4.42	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	475/1412	4.07	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	643/1381	4.08	3.83	4.08	3.97	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	8	4	3.88	1105/1500	3.75	4.09	4.18	4.20	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	802/1517	4.77	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	756/1497	4.19	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	1	10	4.25	1047/1440	4.52	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	1157/1448	4.69	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	1127/1436	4.06	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	935/1432	4.32	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	582/1221	4.32	4.08	3.93	4.02	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	477/1280	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.08	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	930/1277	4.15	4.35	4.34	4.33	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	875/1269	4.17	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 854	4.15	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	98/ 215	4.56	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.47	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	95/ 228	4.48	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.47	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	116/ 217	4.68	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.53	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	144/ 216	4.45	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.36	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	118/ 205	4.02	4.30	4.23	4.37	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0401
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 161
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	350/1522	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	702/1522	4.34	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	578/1285	4.42	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	722/1412	4.07	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	663/1381	4.08	3.83	4.08	3.97	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	2	3	5	3.40	1357/1500	3.75	4.09	4.18	4.20	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	341/1517	4.77	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	602/1497	4.19	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	682/1440	4.52	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	897/1448	4.69	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	980/1436	4.06	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	682/1432	4.32	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	373/1221	4.32	4.08	3.93	4.02	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	572/1280	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.08	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	721/1277	4.15	4.35	4.34	4.33	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	875/1269	4.17	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	538/ 854	4.15	3.94	4.02	4.00	3.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	63/ 215	4.56	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	83/ 228	4.48	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	106/ 217	4.68	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.58	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	121/ 216	4.45	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	2	0	3	5	3.58	181/ 205	4.02	4.30	4.23	4.37	3.58	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	25/ 47	4.50	4.25	4.41	4.83	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0401
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 161
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0501
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 162
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	791/1522	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	894/1522	4.34	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	825/1285	4.42	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	982/1476	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	760/1412	4.07	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	1000/1381	4.08	3.83	4.08	3.97	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	860/1500	3.75	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	952/1517	4.77	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	8	3	3.79	1126/1497	4.19	3.96	4.11	4.11	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	984/1440	4.52	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	1224/1448	4.69	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1224/1436	4.06	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1108/1432	4.32	4.18	4.29	4.31	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	387/1221	4.32	4.08	3.93	4.02	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	839/1280	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.08	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	508/1277	4.15	4.35	4.34	4.33	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	493/1269	4.17	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	569/ 854	4.15	3.94	4.02	4.00	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	102/ 215	4.56	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	101/ 228	4.48	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	112/ 217	4.68	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	158/ 216	4.45	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.22	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	167/ 205	4.02	4.30	4.23	4.37	3.89	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	4.50	4.25	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0501
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 162
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 267
 Questionnaires: 138

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 163
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	11	0	0	1	16	39	71	4.42	720/1522	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	4	16	59	49	4.20	935/1522	4.20	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	2	6	20	48	52	4.11	882/1285	4.11	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	56	0	3	11	27	31	4.19	860/1476	4.19	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	7	11	13	30	31	35	3.55	1138/1412	3.55	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	60	2	3	16	19	26	3.97	858/1381	3.97	3.83	4.08	4.13	3.97	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	2	5	24	35	61	4.17	871/1500	4.17	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	6	121	4.95	244/1517	4.95	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	3	0	1	15	71	23	4.05	865/1497	3.94	3.96	4.11	4.13	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	5	21	99	4.75	452/1440	4.65	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	3	14	108	4.84	656/1448	4.84	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	3	11	40	71	4.43	684/1436	4.34	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	3	10	23	89	4.58	548/1432	4.50	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	2	2	2	6	29	78	4.53	265/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	87	0	3	3	8	12	25	4.04	707/1280	4.04	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	87	0	1	1	8	7	34	4.41	682/1277	4.41	4.35	4.34	4.38	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	88	0	1	1	6	11	31	4.40	671/1269	4.40	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	90	15	0	1	11	9	12	3.97	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	17	0.00-0.99	1	A	29	Required for Majors		9	Graduate	0	Major	70
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	54							
56-83	20	2.00-2.99	8	C	18	General		8	Under-grad	138	Non-major	68
84-150	22	3.00-3.49	17	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	41	F	1	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		86				
				?	5							

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: OMLAND, KEVIN E (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 267
 Questionnaires: 138

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 164
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	11	0	0	1	16	39	71	4.42	720/1522	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	4	16	59	49	4.20	935/1522	4.20	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	2	6	20	48	52	4.11	882/1285	4.11	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	56	0	3	11	27	31	4.19	860/1476	4.19	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	7	11	13	30	31	35	3.55	1138/1412	3.55	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	60	2	3	16	19	26	3.97	858/1381	3.97	3.83	4.08	4.13	3.97	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	2	5	24	35	61	4.17	871/1500	4.17	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	6	121	4.95	244/1517	4.95	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	50	1	2	4	17	48	16	3.83	1097/1497	3.94	3.96	4.11	4.13	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	52	0	0	0	9	21	56	4.55	751/1440	4.65	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	51	0	0	0	2	10	75	4.84	683/1448	4.84	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	52	0	1	4	14	21	46	4.24	886/1436	4.34	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	3	10	17	56	4.43	732/1432	4.50	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	55	6	4	4	11	21	37	4.08	582/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	87	0	3	3	8	12	25	4.04	707/1280	4.04	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	87	0	1	1	8	7	34	4.41	682/1277	4.41	4.35	4.34	4.38	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	88	0	1	1	6	11	31	4.40	671/1269	4.40	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	90	15	0	1	11	9	12	3.97	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	17	0.00-0.99 1	A 29	Required for Majors	9
28-55	14	1.00-1.99 0	B 54		
56-83	20	2.00-2.99 8	C 18	General	8
84-150	22	3.00-3.49 17	D 0	Under-grad	138
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 41	F 1	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 5	Other	86

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	11	15	41	46	16	3.32	1454/1522	3.32	4.29	4.30	4.34	3.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	13	15	49	35	16	3.20	1458/1522	3.20	4.11	4.26	4.25	3.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	9	21	40	39	19	3.30	1216/1285	3.30	4.01	4.30	4.30	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	78	6	11	16	8	6	2.94	1427/1476	2.94	4.02	4.22	4.26	2.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	3	11	12	33	30	36	3.56	1138/1412	3.56	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	91	5	4	14	4	7	3.12	****/1381	****	3.83	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	1	2	7	26	31	58	4.10	940/1500	4.10	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	2	1	1	2	68	51	4.36	1201/1517	4.36	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	36	2	10	15	39	28	8	3.09	1410/1497	3.15	3.96	4.11	4.13	3.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	2	5	26	38	53	4.09	1155/1440	3.78	4.44	4.45	4.46	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	1	5	23	51	44	4.06	1346/1448	3.95	4.64	4.71	4.71	3.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	13	17	40	31	22	3.26	1349/1436	3.18	4.18	4.29	4.30	3.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	15	17	31	41	19	3.26	1333/1432	3.23	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	8	13	14	29	28	31	3.43	938/1221	3.25	4.08	3.93	3.94	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	104	0	10	4	8	5	7	2.85	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	104	0	4	3	6	8	13	3.68	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	104	0	5	2	6	7	14	3.68	****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	104	20	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	133	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	134	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	134	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	135	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	136	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	137	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	136	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.39	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	137	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	136	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 2	A 26	Required for Majors	1
28-55	20	1.00-1.99 0	B 44		Graduate 1
56-83	25	2.00-2.99 13	C 24	General	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 20	D 1		Under-grad 137
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 18	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3	Other	94

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	11	15	41	46	16	3.32	1454/1522	3.32	4.29	4.30	4.34	3.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	13	15	49	35	16	3.20	1458/1522	3.20	4.11	4.26	4.25	3.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	9	21	40	39	19	3.30	1216/1285	3.30	4.01	4.30	4.30	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	78	6	11	16	8	6	2.94	1427/1476	2.94	4.02	4.22	4.26	2.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	3	11	12	33	30	36	3.56	1138/1412	3.56	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	91	5	4	14	4	7	3.12	****/1381	****	3.83	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	1	2	7	26	31	58	4.10	940/1500	4.10	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	2	1	1	2	68	51	4.36	1201/1517	4.36	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	42	1	10	8	40	26	11	3.21	1382/1497	3.15	3.96	4.11	4.13	3.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	9	10	35	31	24	3.47	1365/1440	3.78	4.44	4.45	4.46	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	5	10	22	34	38	3.83	1394/1448	3.95	4.64	4.71	4.71	3.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	12	23	30	31	13	3.09	1373/1436	3.18	4.18	4.29	4.30	3.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	20	7	32	31	19	3.20	1344/1432	3.23	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	25	12	13	27	21	11	3.07	1056/1221	3.25	4.08	3.93	3.94	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	104	0	10	4	8	5	7	2.85	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	104	0	4	3	6	8	13	3.68	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	104	0	5	2	6	7	14	3.68	****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	104	20	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	133	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.21	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	134	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	134	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	135	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	136	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	137	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	136	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.39	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	137	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	136	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 2	A 26	Required for Majors	1
28-55	20	1.00-1.99 0	B 44		Graduate 1
56-83	25	2.00-2.99 13	C 24	General	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 20	D 1		Under-grad 137
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 18	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	94
			? 3		

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 167
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	11	2	3.81	1264/1522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	654/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	531/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	860/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	1	5	2	3.25	1287/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	4	7	1	3.33	1227/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	720/1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	341/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	782/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	256/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	897/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	865/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	8	5	4.07	1009/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	578/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1106/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1094/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1194/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	160/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.07	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	173/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.07	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	108/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	66/ 216	4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.77	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	82/ 205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.43	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 167
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0202
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 168
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	791/1522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	811/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	825/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	7	4.06	982/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	5	2	4	3.36	1248/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	9	4	4.00	806/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	799/1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	292/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	769/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	578/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	1048/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	876/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	1	11	4.25	884/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	0	7	5	4.15	532/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	459/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	547/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	654/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	155/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	83/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	98/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	69/ 216	4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	56/ 205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0202
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 168
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0301
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 169
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	859/1522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	592/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	9	7	4.29	738/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	2	0	6	8	4.25	792/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	964/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	7	4	3.71	1076/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	527/1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	292/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	534/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	320/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	548/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	576/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	611/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	351/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	286/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	867/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	586/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	59/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.69	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	45/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	110/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	69/ 216	4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	41/ 205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.69	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0301
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 170
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	859/1522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	592/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	9	7	4.29	738/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	2	0	6	8	4.25	792/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	964/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	7	4	3.71	1076/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	527/1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	292/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	481/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	851/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	840/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	564/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	600/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	442/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	286/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	867/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	586/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	59/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.69	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	45/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	110/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	69/ 216	4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	41/ 205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.69	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0302
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 171
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	1033/1522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	477/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	674/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1233/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	4	6	3.80	973/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	5	5	3.94	898/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	780/1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	555/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	695/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	798/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	859/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	601/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	935/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.99	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	394/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	907/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	375/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	586/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	131/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	135/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	147/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.42	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	139/ 216	4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.42	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	84/ 205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.42	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0302
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 172
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	1033/1522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	477/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	674/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1233/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	4	6	3.80	973/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	5	5	3.94	898/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	780/1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	555/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	602/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1148/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	1319/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1003/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1170/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.99	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	759/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	907/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	375/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	586/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	131/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	135/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	147/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.42	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	139/ 216	4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.42	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	84/ 205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.42	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	2	5	10	4.16	1001/1522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	750/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	509/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	903/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	728/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	643/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	670/1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	623/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	3	4	7	3.88	1057/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	392/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	1036/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	6	12	4.47	636/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	5	12	4.32	838/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	373/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	743/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	586/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	747/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	131/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	71/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.58	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	51/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	69/ 216	4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	84/ 205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.42	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	3.33	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	Graduate 0
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 11
					Electives 0
					#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	19	
?	1			

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0402
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 174
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	814/1522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	545/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	752/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	11	4	4.12	945/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	5	6	3	3.67	1077/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	10	5	4.11	743/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	374/1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	292/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	232/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	604/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	1060/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	741/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	707/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	359/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	70/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.63	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	45/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	76/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	56/ 216	4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	23/ 205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 1		

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0501
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 175
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	1074/1522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	322/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	337/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	815/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	5	2	3	3.55	1143/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	806/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	615/1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	623/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	820/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	452/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1089/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	502/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	350/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	124/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1161/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1136/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1194/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	47/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.78	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	101/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	65/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	183/ 216	4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	3.88	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	137/ 205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.11	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0501
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 175
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0502
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 176
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	9	2	3.60	1365/1522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	935/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	8	5	4.07	904/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	10	3	3.93	1091/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	5	4	3	3.47	1189/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	3	3.67	1097/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1058/1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	837/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	9	1	3.85	1081/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	492/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	897/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	720/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	928/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	408/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	109/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.42	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	83/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	147/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.42	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	154/ 216	4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	84/ 205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.42	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.34	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 15	Non-major 4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 0			

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY
 Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 227
 Questionnaires: 99

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 177
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	6	10	26	23	27	3.60	1368/1522	3.60	4.29	4.30	4.34	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	14	21	27	14	15	2.95	1488/1522	2.95	4.11	4.26	4.25	2.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	1	15	23	21	17	15	2.93	1259/1285	2.93	4.01	4.30	4.30	2.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	80	5	0	2	2	3	2.83	****/1476	****	4.02	4.22	4.26	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	3	12	18	20	20	18	3.16	1310/1412	3.16	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	81	4	1	2	2	1	2.50	****/1381	****	3.83	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	1	24	10	16	18	21	3.02	1428/1500	3.02	4.09	4.18	4.13	3.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	2	0	0	0	1	89	4.99	98/1517	4.99	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.99	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	22	15	28	17	2	2.55	1475/1497	2.77	3.96	4.11	4.13	2.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	10	10	16	28	27	3.57	1349/1440	3.88	4.44	4.45	4.46	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	7	7	15	24	38	3.87	1389/1448	3.91	4.64	4.71	4.71	3.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	23	13	25	19	11	2.80	1403/1436	3.11	4.18	4.29	4.30	3.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	15	21	19	15	19	3.02	1362/1432	3.23	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	9	18	11	20	15	16	3.00	1064/1221	3.37	4.08	3.93	3.94	3.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	87	0	5	1	4	1	1	2.33	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	87	0	4	1	3	2	2	2.75	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	87	0	3	1	3	2	3	3.08	****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 28	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 47
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 27		
56-83	32	2.00-2.99 7	C 20	General 1	Under-grad 99 Non-major 52
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 15	D 3		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 28	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 74	
			? 6		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	6	10	26	23	27	3.60	1368/1522	3.60	4.29	4.30	4.34	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	14	21	27	14	15	2.95	1488/1522	2.95	4.11	4.26	4.25	2.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	1	15	23	21	17	15	2.93	1259/1285	2.93	4.01	4.30	4.30	2.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	80	5	0	2	2	3	2.83	****/1476	****	4.02	4.22	4.26	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	3	12	18	20	20	18	3.16	1310/1412	3.16	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	81	4	1	2	2	1	2.50	****/1381	****	3.83	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	1	24	10	16	18	21	3.02	1428/1500	3.02	4.09	4.18	4.13	3.02	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	2	0	0	0	1	89	4.99	98/1517	4.99	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.99	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	14	9	28	28	4	2.99	1422/1497	2.77	3.96	4.11	4.13	2.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	3	2	15	20	43	4.18	1100/1440	3.88	4.44	4.45	4.46	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	3	6	18	21	35	3.95	1369/1448	3.91	4.64	4.71	4.71	3.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	7	12	20	27	17	3.42	1308/1436	3.11	4.18	4.29	4.30	3.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	9	13	16	21	23	3.44	1294/1432	3.23	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	4	7	8	12	20	29	3.74	797/1221	3.37	4.08	3.93	3.94	3.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	87	0	5	1	4	1	1	2.33	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	87	0	4	1	3	2	2	2.75	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	87	0	3	1	3	2	3	3.08	****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 28	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 47
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 27		
56-83	32	2.00-2.99 7	C 20	General 1	Under-grad 99 Non-major 52
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 15	D 3		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 28	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 74	
			? 6		

Course-Section: BIOL 304L 0101
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY LAB
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN
 Enrollment: 94
 Questionnaires: 78

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 179
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	0	0	7	26	37	4.43	707/1522	4.43	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	4	20	44	4.59	454/1522	4.59	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	2	3	10	26	28	4.09	893/1285	4.09	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	1	0	2	7	23	36	4.37	671/1476	4.37	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	3	0	1	12	14	37	4.36	475/1412	4.36	4.06	4.06	4.03	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	2	0	0	12	25	28	4.25	614/1381	4.25	3.83	4.08	4.13	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	1	0	2	6	14	45	4.52	463/1500	4.52	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	5	62	4.93	389/1517	4.93	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	5	32	36	4.42	481/1497	4.42	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	0	0	6	46	4.88	224/1440	4.88	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	0	1	5	45	4.86	602/1448	4.86	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	0	0	4	8	39	4.69	394/1436	4.69	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	3	6	42	4.76	338/1432	4.76	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	13	5	1	7	6	15	3.74	797/1221	3.74	4.08	3.93	3.94	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	59	0	1	0	7	4	7	3.84	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	59	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	60	0	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	62	8	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	1	13	21	4.57	78/ 215	4.57	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	3	4	28	4.71	53/ 228	4.71	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	2	7	26	4.69	87/ 217	4.69	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	1	1	0	1	7	25	4.62	103/ 216	4.62	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.62	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	1	2	5	27	4.66	49/ 205	4.66	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.66	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	77	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	77	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	77	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	77	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 22	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 49
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 32		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 8	C 7	General 1	Under-grad 78 Non-major 29
84-150	38	3.00-3.49 14	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 59	
			? 3		

Course-Section: BIOL 305 0101
 Title COMP. ANIMAL PHYSIOLOG
 Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E
 Enrollment: 201
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 180
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	6	8	27	21	3.97	1161/1522	3.97	4.29	4.30	4.34	3.97	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	12	19	16	11	3.25	1442/1522	3.25	4.11	4.26	4.25	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	14	12	18	14	3.39	1204/1285	3.39	4.01	4.30	4.30	3.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	49	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	****/1476	****	4.02	4.22	4.26	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	6	7	22	27	4.13	680/1412	4.13	4.06	4.06	4.03	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	51	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	****/1381	****	3.83	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	5	11	19	27	4.10	940/1500	4.10	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	57	4.90	487/1517	4.90	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	6	9	16	18	7	3.20	1388/1497	3.20	3.96	4.11	4.13	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	10	18	33	4.30	1007/1440	4.30	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	7	27	29	4.35	1266/1448	4.35	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	5	9	16	18	13	3.41	1315/1436	3.41	4.18	4.29	4.30	3.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	10	9	12	14	18	3.33	1320/1432	3.33	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	3	16	18	24	3.98	623/1221	3.98	4.08	3.93	3.94	3.98	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	49	0	3	2	5	2	3	3.00	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	0	2	5	0	7	3.86	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	50	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	49	11	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 15	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 48
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 6	C 20	General 0	Under-grad 64 Non-major 16
84-150	39	3.00-3.49 18	D 4		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 18	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 58	
			? 3		

Course-Section: BIOL 305L 0101
 Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 98
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 181
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	1	5	7	43	4.58	525/1522	4.58	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	5	44	4.61	419/1522	4.61	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	4	5	12	34	4.32	714/1285	4.32	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	6	15	34	4.46	535/1476	4.46	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	7	1	4	5	10	27	4.23	585/1412	4.23	4.06	4.06	4.03	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	4	0	6	8	13	23	4.06	774/1381	4.06	3.83	4.08	4.13	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	6	16	31	4.34	700/1500	4.34	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.34	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	50	4.89	509/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	2	0	4	17	24	4.30	612/1497	4.30	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	1	6	41	4.78	412/1440	4.78	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	3	45	4.90	521/1448	4.90	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	11	37	4.73	326/1436	4.73	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	9	39	4.81	280/1432	4.81	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	1	0	7	11	27	4.37	387/1221	4.37	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	49	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	49	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	49	3	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	1	0	2	7	26	4.58	77/ 215	4.58	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	5	30	4.81	35/ 228	4.81	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.81	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	39/ 217	4.89	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.89	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	1	0	4	31	4.81	58/ 216	4.81	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	10	0	0	1	11	14	4.50	67/ 205	4.50	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.50	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	3.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	35	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	50
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	59	Non-major	9
84-150	31	3.00-3.49	17	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	48				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 396 0101
 Title UGRAD TCHNG ASSISTANTS
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 182
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1497	5.00	3.96	4.11	4.13	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.44	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.18	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	279/1221	4.50	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 414 0101
 Title EUKARYOTICS GEN/MOL BI
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, PHIL
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 183
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	11	16	4.45	681/1522	4.45	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	13	10	4.14	996/1522	4.14	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	14	12	4.32	714/1285	4.32	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	12	12	4.29	758/1476	4.29	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	3	5	8	9	3.92	865/1412	3.92	4.06	4.06	4.11	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	6	10	7	3.88	953/1381	3.88	3.83	4.08	4.21	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	13	12	4.37	660/1500	4.37	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	15	7	4.17	756/1497	4.17	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	22	4.66	617/1440	4.66	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	783/1448	4.79	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	7	11	10	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	6	18	4.31	838/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	6	19	4.59	219/1221	4.59	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.09	4.10	4.28	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	517/1277	4.61	4.35	4.34	4.50	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	341/ 854	4.24	3.94	4.02	4.31	4.24	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	3.85	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 414 0101
 Title EUKARYOTICS GEN/MOL BI
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, PHIL
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 183
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	11	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	11	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	4						

Course-Section: BIOL 420 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS:CELL BIOLOG
 Instructor: MCGRAW, PATRICI
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 184
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	1402/1522	3.50	4.29	4.30	4.42	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	4	3	3.58	1331/1522	3.58	4.11	4.26	4.34	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	5	1	3.33	1210/1285	3.33	4.01	4.30	4.42	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1169/1476	3.82	4.02	4.22	4.31	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	6	2	3.64	1094/1412	3.64	4.06	4.06	4.11	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1130/1381	3.60	3.83	4.08	4.21	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	4	2	3	3.55	1283/1500	3.55	4.09	4.18	4.25	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	4	3	1	0	2	2.30	1516/1517	2.30	4.73	4.65	4.71	2.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	7	0	0	2.78	1454/1497	2.78	3.96	4.11	4.21	2.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	7	2	2	3.33	1385/1440	3.33	4.44	4.45	4.52	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	1300/1448	4.25	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	6	4	1	3.33	1334/1436	3.33	4.18	4.29	4.32	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	7	1	3.73	1203/1432	3.73	4.18	4.29	4.34	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	759/1221	3.80	4.08	3.93	4.04	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	988/1280	3.60	4.09	4.10	4.28	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1050/1277	3.80	4.35	4.34	4.50	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1097/1269	3.60	4.35	4.31	4.49	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 428 0101
 Title: COMPUTER APPL MOLEC BI
 Instructor: ONEILL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 185
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1496/1522	2.83	4.11	4.26	4.34	2.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1279/1285	2.00	4.01	4.30	4.42	2.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1380/1476	3.25	4.02	4.22	4.31	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1398/1412	2.20	4.06	4.06	4.11	2.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1130/1381	3.60	3.83	4.08	4.21	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1411/1500	3.17	4.09	4.18	4.25	3.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1395/1497	3.17	3.96	4.11	4.21	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1432/1440	2.33	4.44	4.45	4.52	2.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1393/1448	3.83	4.64	4.71	4.75	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1411/1436	2.67	4.18	4.29	4.32	2.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1320/1432	3.33	4.18	4.29	4.34	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	4.08	3.93	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1150/1280	3.20	4.09	4.10	4.28	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1171/1277	3.40	4.35	4.34	4.50	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1207/1269	3.00	4.35	4.31	4.49	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	832/ 854	2.50	3.94	4.02	4.31	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	3.85	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 430 0101
 Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: GLUICK, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 186
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	9	17	18	4.06	1081/1522	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	5	12	17	11	3.64	1313/1522	3.64	4.11	4.26	4.34	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	7	14	15	11	3.64	1132/1285	3.64	4.01	4.30	4.42	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	5	14	14	11	3.59	1289/1476	3.59	4.02	4.22	4.31	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	12	12	16	3.86	924/1412	3.86	4.06	4.06	4.11	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	3	5	11	9	8	3.39	1206/1381	3.39	3.83	4.08	4.21	3.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	4	10	16	16	3.96	1038/1500	3.96	4.09	4.18	4.25	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	46	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	4	13	19	5	3.49	1286/1497	3.49	3.96	4.11	4.21	3.49	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	7	9	20	6	3.42	1371/1440	3.42	4.44	4.45	4.52	3.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	6	9	29	4.47	1190/1448	4.47	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	7	18	16	2	3.20	1358/1436	3.20	4.18	4.29	4.32	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	7	11	16	9	3.51	1267/1432	3.51	4.18	4.29	4.34	3.51	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	2	5	19	14	3.98	632/1221	3.98	4.08	3.93	4.04	3.98	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.28	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.50	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.49	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	40	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.47	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51	4.55	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.00	****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	3.85	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 430 0101
 Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: GLUICK, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 186
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	32
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	26						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	48	Non-major	16
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	39				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 434 0101
 Title MICROBIAL MOLEC GENETI
 Instructor: WOLF, RICHARD E
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 187
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	443/1522	4.65	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	522/1522	4.52	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	509/1285	4.52	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	566/1476	4.44	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	17	4.61	283/1412	4.61	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	938/1381	3.90	3.83	4.08	4.21	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	232/1500	4.74	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	348/1497	4.55	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	256/1440	4.87	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	602/1448	4.87	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	10	13	4.57	527/1436	4.57	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	316/1432	4.78	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	5	5	9	4.10	572/1221	4.10	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.09	4.10	4.28	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	470/1277	4.67	4.35	4.34	4.50	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	763/1269	4.28	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	14	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	8	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 443 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS:DEVEL BIOLO
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, DAPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 188
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	380/1522	4.71	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	465/1522	4.57	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.01	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	205/1412	4.69	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	220/1381	4.64	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	0	9	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1019/1517	4.57	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	633/1497	4.41	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.44	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1436	4.86	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	200/1221	4.63	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.35	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.31	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	7
?	0		

Course-Section: BIOL 443 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS:DEVEL BIOLO
 Instructor: BIEBERICH, CHAR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 189
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	380/1522	4.71	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	465/1522	4.57	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.01	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	205/1412	4.69	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	220/1381	4.64	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	0	9	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1019/1517	4.57	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	355/1497	4.41	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.44	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1436	4.86	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	200/1221	4.63	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.35	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.31	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	7
?	0		

Course-Section: BIOL 445 0101
 Title SIGNAL TRANSDUCTION
 Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 190
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	525/1522	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	592/1522	4.48	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	478/1285	4.55	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	367/1476	4.62	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	101/1412	4.90	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	713/1381	4.14	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	3	12	4.19	839/1500	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	11	5	4.11	833/1497	4.26	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	272/1440	4.90	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	765/1448	4.88	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	741/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	669/1432	4.60	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	279/1221	4.62	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	179/1280	4.82	4.09	4.10	4.28	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.35	4.34	4.50	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	117/ 854	4.73	3.94	4.02	4.31	4.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: BIOL 445 0101
 Title SIGNAL TRANSDUCTION
 Instructor: EISENMANN, DAVI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 191
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	525/1522	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	592/1522	4.48	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	478/1285	4.55	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	367/1476	4.62	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	101/1412	4.90	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	713/1381	4.14	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	3	12	4.19	839/1500	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	493/1497	4.26	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	115/1440	4.90	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	296/1448	4.88	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	263/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	383/1432	4.60	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	134/1221	4.62	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	179/1280	4.82	4.09	4.10	4.28	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.35	4.34	4.50	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	117/ 854	4.73	3.94	4.02	4.31	4.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 454 0101
 Title VISION SCIENCE
 Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 192
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	380/1522	4.71	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	465/1522	4.57	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	456/1285	4.57	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	299/1412	4.57	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	575/1381	4.29	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	600/1500	4.43	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	481/1497	4.57	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	532/1440	4.79	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	696/1436	4.50	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	227/1432	4.93	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	232/1221	4.64	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	624/1280	4.20	4.09	4.10	4.28	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.35	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1269	4.60	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	3.94	4.02	4.31	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 454 0101
 Title VISION SCIENCE
 Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 193
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	380/1522	4.71	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	465/1522	4.57	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	456/1285	4.57	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	299/1412	4.57	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	575/1381	4.29	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	600/1500	4.43	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	223/1497	4.57	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1440	4.79	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	514/1436	4.50	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1432	4.93	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	144/1221	4.64	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	624/1280	4.20	4.09	4.10	4.28	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.35	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1269	4.60	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	3.94	4.02	4.31	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Instructor: LU, HUA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

Spring 2007
 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1006/1522	4.13	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	357/1476	4.63	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	214/1412	4.69	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	470/1381	4.38	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	660/1500	4.38	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	555/1517	4.88	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	993/1497	4.07	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1440	4.82	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	395/1448	4.93	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	845/1436	4.46	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	1036/1432	4.11	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	175/1221	4.70	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.28	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.35	4.34	4.50	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	380/ 854	4.17	3.94	4.02	4.31	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 456 0101
 Title PLANT MOLECULAR BIOLOG
 Instructor: MILLER, STEPHEN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 195
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1006/1522	4.13	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	357/1476	4.63	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	214/1412	4.69	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	470/1381	4.38	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	660/1500	4.38	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	555/1517	4.88	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	718/1497	4.07	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	272/1440	4.82	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	395/1448	4.93	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	436/1436	4.46	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	914/1432	4.11	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	139/1221	4.70	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.35	4.34	4.50	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	380/ 854	4.17	3.94	4.02	4.31	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 3
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		13
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101
 Title SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS
 Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 196
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	218/1522	4.84	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	7	11	4.42	670/1522	4.42	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	650/1285	4.40	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	454/1476	4.53	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	852/1412	3.94	4.06	4.06	4.11	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	314/1381	4.53	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	924/1500	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	370/1497	4.53	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	392/1440	4.79	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	296/1448	4.95	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	514/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	174/1432	4.89	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	92/1221	4.83	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	337/1280	4.58	4.09	4.10	4.28	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.35	4.34	4.50	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	200/1269	4.92	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	153/ 854	4.64	3.94	4.02	4.31	4.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	116/ 215	4.38	4.37	4.36	4.47	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	154/ 228	4.25	4.47	4.35	4.32	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	41/ 217	4.88	4.48	4.51	4.55	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	100/ 216	4.63	4.41	4.42	4.20	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	135/ 205	4.13	4.30	4.23	3.85	4.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.22	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	4.33	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	4.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	4.25	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101
 Title SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS
 Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 196
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 636L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 197
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.11	4.26	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.01	4.30	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	207/1476	4.78	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.06	4.06	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	136/1381	4.78	3.83	4.08	4.25	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.09	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	172/1497	4.56	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1440	4.90	4.44	4.45	4.48	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	141/1436	4.84	4.18	4.29	4.37	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	187/1432	4.84	4.18	4.29	4.33	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1221	4.90	4.08	3.93	3.83	4.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.35	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	106/ 854	4.75	3.94	4.02	4.08	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	4.37	4.36	4.72	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 228	5.00	4.47	4.35	4.39	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.48	4.51	4.61	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	4.41	4.42	4.76	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 205	5.00	4.30	4.23	4.40	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.38	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.67	4.63	4.82	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.79	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	14/ 22	4.67	4.67	4.54	4.83	4.67	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	10/ 18	4.67	4.67	4.49	4.92	4.67	

Course-Section: BIOL 636L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 197
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 636L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 198
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.11	4.26	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.01	4.30	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	207/1476	4.78	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.06	4.06	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	136/1381	4.78	3.83	4.08	4.25	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.09	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	573/1497	4.56	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1440	4.90	4.44	4.45	4.48	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1436	4.84	4.18	4.29	4.37	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1432	4.84	4.18	4.29	4.33	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	99/1221	4.90	4.08	3.93	3.83	4.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.35	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	106/ 854	4.75	3.94	4.02	4.08	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	4.37	4.36	4.72	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 228	5.00	4.47	4.35	4.39	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.48	4.51	4.61	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	4.41	4.42	4.76	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 205	5.00	4.30	4.23	4.40	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.38	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.67	4.63	4.82	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	4.68	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.79	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	14/ 22	4.67	4.67	4.54	4.83	4.67	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	10/ 18	4.67	4.67	4.49	4.92	4.67	

Course-Section: BIOL 636L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 198
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 654 0101
 Title VISION SCIENCE
 Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 199
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1365/1522	3.50	4.11	4.26	4.29	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.01	4.30	4.31	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.06	4.06	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1152/1381	3.50	3.83	4.08	4.25	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.09	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.73	4.65	4.73	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	898/1497	4.25	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1359/1440	4.00	4.44	4.45	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1056/1436	4.25	4.18	4.29	4.37	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1432	4.75	4.18	4.29	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1165/1221	3.25	4.08	3.93	3.83	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1187/1280	3.00	4.09	4.10	4.24	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.35	4.34	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	3.94	4.02	4.08	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 654 0101
 Title VISION SCIENCE
 Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 200
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1365/1522	3.50	4.11	4.26	4.29	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.01	4.30	4.31	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.06	4.06	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1152/1381	3.50	3.83	4.08	4.25	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.09	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.73	4.65	4.73	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.25	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	798/1440	4.00	4.44	4.45	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	601/1436	4.25	4.18	4.29	4.37	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	4.75	4.18	4.29	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	606/1221	3.25	4.08	3.93	3.83	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1187/1280	3.00	4.09	4.10	4.24	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.35	4.34	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	3.94	4.02	4.08	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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