Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor: STAFF Enrollment: 281

Questionnaires: 177

(Instr. A)

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 176 Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	3	33	63	73	4.18	977/1639	4.24	4.36	4.27	4.08	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	8	36	68	60		1082/1639	4.07	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.01
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	11	41	51	68		1006/1397	4.02	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	61	7	7	40	30	29		1370/1583	3.69	4.03	4.19	4.01	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	5	2	23			4.36	488/1532	4.10	3.80	4.01	3.88	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		79	6	7	27	23	31		1092/1504	3.68	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	13	43	44	69	3.93	1135/1612	4.01	4.03	4.16	4.10	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	0	1		168		265/1635	4.96	4.91	4.65	4.56	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	39	2	3	9	54	55	15	3.51	1313/1579	3.81	3.91	4.08	3.95	3.71
Taskuus														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	3	14	40	106	4 E0	807/1518	4.54	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5 5	0	1	3 7	17		112				4.39	4.43		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly			6	14	35	62	54		1230/1520 1217/1517	4.58 4.16		4.70	4.61	4.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6 4	0 1	4	11	32	46	79		1043/1550	4.16	$4.07 \\ 4.14$	4.27	4.20	4.08 4.22
-	_		4	8									4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	/	8	34	29	83	4.07	590/1295	4.18	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	21	14	33	31	54	3.54	1093/1398	3.70	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	7	7	27	39	73	4.07	950/1391	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	9	9	30	41	64		1016/1388	3.98	4.16	4.28	4.01	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	24	29	16	14	22	38	34	3.48	733/ 958				3.71	3.48
									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	176	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	3.90	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	176	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	174	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	4.49	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar			_	_	_	_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	176	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 78		4.50	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation		0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 37	****	****	4.75		****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	176			0					, -	****	****		5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	176	0	0	U	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32			4.56	4.60	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	175	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	176	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 176 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 281
Questionnaires: 177

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	66	0.00-0.99	12	A	40	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	1	Major	53
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	В	65						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	С	44	General	0	Under-grad	176	Non-major	124
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	11	D	5						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	147				
				?	7						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor: STAFF (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 281 Questionnaires: 177

Title

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 177 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	3	33	63	73	4.18	977/1639	4.24	4.36	4.27	4.08	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	8	36	68	60	4.01	1082/1639	4.07	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.01
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	11	41	51	68		1006/1397	4.02	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	61	7	7	40	30	29		1370/1583	3.69	4.03	4.19	4.01	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	5	2	23		103	4.36	488/1532		3.80	4.01	3.88	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	79	6	7	27	23	31		1092/1504		3.75	4.05	3.78	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	13	43	44	69		1135/1612		4.03	4.16	4.10	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	0	1		168	4.96	265/1635		4.91	4.65	4.56	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	38	5	0	2	25	63	44	4.11	818/1579	3.81	3.91	4.08	3.95	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	3	8		100	4.51	794/1518		4.39	4.43	4.38	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	2	8		128	4.69	992/1520		4.59	4.70	4.61	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	5	12	61	87	4.37	758/1517	4.16	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	1	4	20	48	95	4.38	787/1550		4.14	4.22	4.17	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	7	4	10	23	35	88	4.21	497/1295	4.18	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	21	14	33	31	54		1093/1398		3.87	4.07	3.85	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	7	7	27	39	73	4.07	950/1391	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	9	9	30	41	64		1016/1388		4.16	4.28	4.01	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	24	29	16	14	22	38	34	3.48	733/ 958	3.57	3.64	3.93	3.71	3.48
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	176	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	176	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	174	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	176	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 215	****	4.49	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	176	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 82		4.63	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32		4.20	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	175	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 32		4.25	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor: STAFF (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 281
Questionnaires: 177

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 177 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

281

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	;
00-27	66	0.00-0.99	12	A	40	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	1	Major	53
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	В	65						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	44	General	0	Under-grad	176	Non-major	124
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	11	D	5						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	ſh
				P	0			responses t	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	147				
				?	7						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

281

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 177

(Instr. C)

Page 178 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2007

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	3	33	63	73	4.18	977/1639	4.24	4.36	4.27	4.08	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	8	36	68	60	4.01	1082/1639	4.07	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.01
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	11	41	51	68	3.98	1006/1397	4.02	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	61	7	7	40	30	29	3.59	1370/1583	3.69	4.03	4.19	4.01	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	5	2	23	38	103	4.36	488/1532	4.10	3.80	4.01	3.88	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	79	6	7	27	23	31	3.70	1092/1504	3.68	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	13	43	44	69	3.93	1135/1612	4.01	4.03	4.16	4.10	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	0	1	0	168	4.96	265/1635	4.96	4.91	4.65	4.56	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	40	3	8	11	40	54	21	3.51	1313/1579	3.81	3.91	4.08	3.95	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	2	3	20	42	97	4.40	957/1518	4.54	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	8	15	41	99	4.40	1279/1520	4.58	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	5	9	23	65	61	4.03	1065/1517	4.16	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	5	5	24	50	81	4.19	944/1550	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.17	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	9	6	22	38	87	4.16	529/1295	4.18	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	21	14	33	31	54	3.54	1093/1398	3.70	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	7	7	27	39	73	4.07	950/1391	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	9	9	30	41	64	3.93	1016/1388	3.98	4.16	4.28	4.01	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	24	29	16	14	22	38	34	3.48	733/ 958	3.57	3.64	3.93	3.71	3.48
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	176	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	174	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	176	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 215	****	4.49	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar	156	•	0	_	-	0	_	2 00	/ 05	als als als als	4 10	4 50	4 50	ate ate ate ate
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 85	***	4.13	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.12	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	++++/ [2	****	****	1 0 1	2 (1	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****		4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53		****	4.05	3.51	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	***	****	4.56	4.60	***
Colf Dogod														
Self Paced	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	1 15	4.54	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		-					-		,	****		4.45		****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	176	0	0	0	1	0	0		, -		4.20	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	175	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32 ****/ 21	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	176	U	U	1	U	0	0	∠.00	****/ 21		4.50	4.52	5.00	

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor:

Enrollment: 281 (Instr. C)

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 178 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 177

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	66	0.00-0.99	12	A	40	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	1	Major	53
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	В	65						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	44	General	0	Under-grad	176	Non-major	124
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	11	D	5						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses t	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	147				
				?	7						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 197 Questionnaires: 152 Fall 2007

Page 179 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	2
---------	--------	------------	---------------	---

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fr	eane	ncie	S		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	14	0	4	3	13	31	87	4.41	754/1639	4.24	4.36	4.27	4.08	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	2	5	20	40	71	4.25	859/1639	4.07	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	1	3	9	23	30	72	4.16	878/1397	4.02	4.04	4.28	4.18	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	51	2	5	20	24	36		1010/1583	3.69	4.03	4.19	4.01	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	15	40	14	15	20	20	28	3.34	1325/1532	4.10	3.80	4.01	3.88	3.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	87	2	9	13	8	18		1141/1504	3.68	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	1	4	4	19	36	74	4.26	814/1612	4.01	4.03	4.16	4.10	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	15	1	0	1	1		130	4.93	463/1635	4.96	4.91	4.65	4.56	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	41	2	4	3	15	44	43	4.09	835/1579	3.81	3.91	4.08	3.95	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	2	7	12	112	4.73	491/1518	4.54	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	1	0	8		114	4.77	872/1520	4.58	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	2	4	14	31	82	4.41	726/1517	4.16	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	4	3	7	14	20	90	4.40	778/1550	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.17	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	1	5	4	17	25	78	4.29	428/1295	4.18	4.03	3.94		4.29
1									-,					
Discussion			_											
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	3	4	20	27	55	4.17	695/1398	3.70	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	3	9	17	21	58	4.13	919/1391	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	5	5	19	22	58	4.13	907/1388	3.98	4.16	4.28	4.01	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	44	37	5	7	16	11	32	3.82	572/ 958	3.57	3.64	3.93	3.71	3.82
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	145	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	147	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	146	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	146	1	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 215	****	4.49	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	147	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.25	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	148	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	149	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	149	2	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	147	1	0	0	2	1	1		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	148	1	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	3.90	****
5. Here effected for grading made effect	110	-	Ü	-	_	J	_	3.33	, 02		1.15	1.10	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	148	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	150	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	150	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	149	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	149	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	149	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	150	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	150	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	149	0	0	0	3	0	0		****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	150	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52		****
1 die die die die die de de die de		•	_		_	J	Ü		, 21		1.55	1.02	3.00	

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 197
Questionnaires: 152

Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 179 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	5
00-27	27	0.00-0.99	9	A	23	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	41
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	В	39						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	34	General	2	Under-grad	152	Non-major	111
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	jh
				P	0			responses to	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	89				
				?	4						

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

(Instr. A)

Instructor:

STAFF

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 180

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did v	zou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4 33	814/1639	3.95	4.36	4.27	4.08	4.33
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	2	2		1090/1639		4.09	4.22	4.17	4.00
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	3	0	2		1268/1397		4.04	4.28	4.18	3.50
		uations reflect			1	0	1	0	2	0			1449/1583		4.03	4.19	4.01	3.40
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	506/1532	4.08	3.80	4.01	3.88	4.33
				o what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1415/1504	3.30	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.00
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1044/1612	3.79	4.03	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How m	many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How w	vould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1232/1579	3.58	3.91	4.08	3.95	3.73
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1162/1518	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.28
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1318/1520	4.46	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.57
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1292/1517	4.05	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.03
4. Did t	he lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1328/1550	4.01	4.14	4.22	4.17	3.95
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	929/1295	3.94	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.55
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1030/1398	3.50	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.67
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.33
3. Did t	the instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	647/1388	4.17	4.16	4.28	4.01	4.50
4. Were	special to	echniques succe	ssful		0	4	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	949/ 958	2.58	3.64	3.93	3.71	1.50
		Self	Paced															
4. Was t	he feedba	ck/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
				⁻														
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	3	A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	\$	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		~	_					0	1	,	_			-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0 F 0								1			1			.1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0 P 0		ET	ectiv	/es				1	#### - :				_][]
				Р 0 Т 0		∩ +1	her					3	respons	es to I	e sign	ıııcan	IL	
				Ι υ		Uti	uer					5						

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

84-150

Grad.

0

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 0

1

D

F

Р

I

0

0

0

0

Title Baltimore County Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Page 181

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	6					
Questionnaires:	6		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

2							Lvai	uu -	011 &										
								Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	ills fro	om this cour	se	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	814/1639	3.95	4.36	4.27	4.08	4.33
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goal	s	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1090/1639	3.71	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	ct the	expected goa	ls	0	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1268/1397	3.68	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.50
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goal	s	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1449/1583	3.13	4.03	4.19	4.01	3.40
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you le	arned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	506/1532	4.08	3.80	4.01	3.88	4.33
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments conti	ribute 1	to what you	learned	0	1	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1415/1504	3.30	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.00
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	ly expla	ained		0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1044/1612	3.79	4.03	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How max	ny times	was class cand	celled			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	all tead	ching effect	iveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1133/1579	3.58	3.91	4.08	3.95	3.73
		Lectur	ce																
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared		1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	947/1518	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.28
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	rested :	in the subje	ct	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.46	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.57
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	ed and	explained cl	early	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	726/1517	4.05	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.03
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	to what	you learned	-	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	769/1550	4.01	4.14	4.22	4.17	3.95
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques er	nhance y	your underst	anding	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	978/1295	3.94	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.55
		Discus	ssion																
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you le	arned	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1030/1398	3.50	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.67
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively er	ncourage	ed to partic	ipate	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.33
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open disc	ussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	647/1388	4.17	4.16	4.28	4.01	4.50
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	essful			0	4	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	949/ 958	2.58	3.64	3.93	3.71	1.50
		Self	Paced																
4. Was th	e feedba	ck/tutoring by	procto	rs helpful		5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****
					Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	Grades				Rea	asons	3			Τy	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	3	A	5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55 56-83	2 0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	B C	0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	5

Electives

Other

1

3

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0201 CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR Baltimore County

Enrollment:

7

University of Maryland Page 182 Title FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN (Instr. A)

Questions							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1466/1639	3.95	4.36	4.27	4.08	3.57
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	0	3.43	1513/1639	3.71	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.43
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1118/1397	3.68	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.86
		uations reflect			0	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1563/1583	3.13	4.03	4.19	4.01	2.86
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	965/1532	4.08	3.80	4.01	3.88	3.83
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1154/1504	3.30	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.60
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1371/1612	3.79	4.03	4.16	4.10	3.57
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	1390/1579	3.58	3.91	4.08	3.95	3.42
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	orepared	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1237/1518	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.14
		ctor seem inter			0	0	1	0	0	1	5		1345/1520		4.59	4.70	4.61	4.36
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43			4.07	4.27	4.20	4.07
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57			4.14	4.22	4.17	4.07
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1295	3.94	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1183/1398	3.50	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.33
				d to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	5		752/1391		4.24	4.30		4.33
		_	_	d open discussion	1	0	1	1	0	0	4		1065/1388			4.28	4.01	3.83
		echniques succe		a open arbeabbion	1	3	0	0	2	0	_		658/ 958					
				_		<u> </u>	,											
				Frequ	ıency	, Dis.	trib	ut 101	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27						Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55			В 3			-			-									
56-83	83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0			Ge	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	6		
84-150				D 0													-	
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
	Р 0												respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	nt	
I 0					Ot1	her					6	_						
	? 0																	

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0201 University of Maryland Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR Baltimore County Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

7

University of Maryland Page 183
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1466/1639	3.95	4.36	4.27	4.08	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the e	xpected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	0	3.43	1513/1639	3.71	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1118/1397	3.68	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the e	xpected goals	0	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1563/1583	3.13	4.03	4.19	4.01	2.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to	what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	965/1532	4.08	3.80	4.01	3.88	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute	to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1154/1504	3.30	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1371/1612	3.79	4.03	4.16	4.10	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1318/1579	3.58	3.91	4.08	3.95	3.42
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1069/1518	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1256/1520	4.46	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1276/1517	4.05	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what	you learned	0	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1306/1550	4.01	4.14	4.22	4.17	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance	your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	894/1295	3.94	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.33
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to	what vou learned	1	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1183/1398	3.50	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.33
2. Were all students actively encourage	_	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair a		1	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	1065/1388		4.16	4.28	4.01	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	658/ 958	2.58	3.64	3.93	3.71	3.67	
Frequ				trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors		

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

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 282 Questionnaires: 245

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 184 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	reque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	25	33	61	72	47	3.35	1543/1639	3.35	4.36	4.27	4.08	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	30	34	69	63	42	3.22	1559/1639	3.22	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	39	39	66	54	38	3.06	1358/1397	3.06	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	5	28	39	57	69	40	3.23	1489/1583	3.23	4.03	4.19	4.01	3.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	2	17	27	42	67	80	3.71	1092/1532	3.71	3.80	4.01	3.88	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	25	35	72	64	39	3.24	1344/1504	3.24	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	42	45	56	51	39	3.00	1519/1612	3.00	4.03	4.16	4.10	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	3	0	0	2	54	172	4.75	899/1635	4.75	4.91	4.65	4.56	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	66	6	32	35	70	31	5	2.66	1541/1579	2.66	3.91	4.08	3.95	2.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	78	0	20	27	39	37	44	3.35	1448/1518	3.35	4.39	4.43	4.38	3.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	80	0	9	18	30	44	64	3.82	1454/1520	3.82	4.59	4.70	4.61	3.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	84	0	21	25	45	43	27	3.19	1436/1517	3.19	4.07	4.27	4.20	3.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	75	7	31	31	37	39	25		1447/1550		4.14	4.22	4.17	2.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	87	5	30	14	41	39	29		1135/1295		4.03	3.94	3.84	3.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	230	0	5	0	2	4	4	3.13	****/1398	****	3.87	4.07	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	233	0	3	1	2	4	2		****/1391	****	4.24	4.30	4.07	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	224	0	2	1	2	12	4		****/1388	****	4.16	4.28	4.01	****
4. Were special techniques successful	233	4	1	3	2	0	2		****/ 958	***	3.64	3.93	3.71	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	68	1	13	12	31	52	68	3.85			4.48	4.10	3.90	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	67	0	7	16	28	57	70	3.94		3.94	4.44	4.11	4.01	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	68	0	5	6	13		110	4.40		4.40	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	66	4	9	5	14		103	4.30	131/ 215	4.30	4.49	4.35	4.43	4.30
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	67	0	13	17	28	54	66	3.80	157/ 198	3.80	3.89	4.18	4.25	3.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	241	0	0	0	0	2	2		****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	241	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	, -		4.63	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	241	0	0	0	0	2	2		****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	238	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	241	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 82	***	4.13	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	243	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	244	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	244	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	244	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	244	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	244	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	244	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	244	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00		****	4.17	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	243	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	244	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	***	4.50	4.52	5.00	***

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 282 Questionnaires: 245

CLAASSEN, LARK

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Earned	ned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	6		15	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	26	1.00-1.99	0	В	58						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	12	C	16	General	1	Under-grad	245	Non-major	214
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	20	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	o be si	.gnificant	
				I	0	Other	83				
				?	6						

Page 184

FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

THE HUMAN ORGANISM

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 117

LAKE, REAGAN Fall 2007

Page 185 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	62	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
				Frequ	encies

Questions			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	9	0	1	0	3	15	34	4.53	593/1639	4.53	4.36	4.27	4.08	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	2	4	15	32	4.39	709/1639	4.39	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	1	1	3	2	20	28	4.31	740/1397	4.31	4.04	4.28	4.18	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	25	1	2	3	9	14	4.14	910/1583	4.14	4.03	4.19	4.01	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	14	9	1	9	11	10	3.30	1343/1532	3.30	3.80	4.01	3.88	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	45	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	****/1504	****	3.75	4.05	3.78	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	1	0	1	2	12	38	4.64	340/1612	4.64	4.03	4.16	4.10	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	2	0	0	0	16	36	4.69	968/1635	4.69	4.91	4.65	4.56	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	4	1	1	4	21	13	4.10	830/1579	4.10	3.91	4.08	3.95	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	3	50	4.91	213/1518	4.91	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	7	46	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	0	5	8	39	4.58	498/1517	4.58	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	3	1	0	3	8	40	4.65	468/1550	4.65	4.14	4.22	4.17	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	5	1	1	2	11	33	4.54	247/1295	4.54	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	3	5	6	10	3.84	912/1398	3.84	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	1	0	4	11	9	4.08	945/1391	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	2	0	3	12	12	4.10	918/1388	4.10	4.16	4.28	4.01	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	36	21	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	3.71	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	57	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.49	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	***	3.89	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	2	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	***	4.50	4.52	5.00	****

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Course-Section: BIOL 106 0101 Title

THE HUMAN ORGANISM

Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 117 Questionnaires: 62 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 185 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	ed Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	 А	10	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	21						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	5	Under-grad	62	Non-major	59
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	2	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	3						

Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO

Instructor: AKINMADE, DAMIL

Instructor: All Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 71

88

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2007

Page 186 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequenci			ncie	cies Instructor				Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General		_	_	_			_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	8	7	28	20	7		1584/1639		4.36	4.27	4.08	3.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	9	12	24	18	8		1577/1639		4.09	4.22	4.17	3.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	12	18	20	12	9		1385/1397		4.04	4.28	4.18	2.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	5	8	16	26	14		1398/1583		4.03	4.19	4.01	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	23	9	7	19	7	6		1464/1532		3.80	4.01	3.88	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	11	12	25	12	9		1427/1504		3.75	4.05	3.78	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0 1	0	9	12 1	17 0	16 6	17 63	3.28 4.87	1466/1612		4.03	4.16	4.10	3.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	17	2	7	8	27	9	1		706/1635 1527/1579		4.91 3.91	4.65 4.08	4.56 3.95	4.87 2.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1/	2	,	0	27	9	1	2.19	1527/1579	2.19	3.91	4.00	3.95	2.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	8	14	16	26	3.81	1351/1518	3.81	4.39	4.43	4.38	3.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	4	6	13	24	19	3.73	1470/1520	3.73	4.59	4.70	4.61	3.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	10	7	22	16	10	3.14	1443/1517	3.14	4.07	4.27	4.20	3.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	10	8	20	16	11	3.15	1422/1550	3.15	4.14	4.22	4.17	3.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	5	5	10	16	22	3.78	825/1295	3.78	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.78
5.														
Discussion	1.0	0	10	11	1.0	11	_	0 01	1200/1200	0 01	2 07	4 07	3.85	2.81
 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Were all students actively encouraged to participate 	18 18	0	4	11 10	16 20	11 10	5 9		1322/1398 1292/1391		3.87 4.24	4.07 4.30	4.07	3.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	10	16	14	12		1242/1391	3.19	4.16	4.28	4.07	3.19
4. Were special techniques successful	19	28	4	5	2	8		3.21			3.64		3.71	3.30
4. Were special techniques successivi	10	20	-	J	2	O	,	3.21	010/ 930	3.21	3.01	3.93	3.71	3.21
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	2	4	9	14	18	3.89	157/ 224	3.89	4.48	4.10	3.90	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	2	4	7	12	22	4.02	146/ 240	4.02	4.44	4.11	4.01	4.02
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	1	0	0	10	36	4.70	83/ 219	4.70	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	3	1	4	17	21	4.13	147/ 215	4.13	4.49	4.35	4.43	4.13
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	2	3	7	15	20	4.02	128/ 198	4.02	3.89	4.18	4.25	4.02
O service service														
Seminar	<i>C</i> 1	1	0	0	2	1	2	1 17	****/ 85	****	1 12	4 50	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	64 64	1	0 1	0	2	1 1	3	4.17	****/ 85 ****/ 82		4.13 4.63	4.58 4.52	4.50 4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	,	****	4.50		4.12	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	63	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	****/ 80	****	5.00	$4.47 \\ 4.47$	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	65	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	3.90	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	03	O	_	O		_		3.30	/ 02		1.13	1.10	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	66	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	66	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	66	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	66	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
0.15 7 1														
Self Paced		^	-	^	_	^	-	2 00	****	****	4 22	4 45	4 - 4	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	66	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 50		4.33	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	66	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 32		4.20	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	66 66	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 43 ****/ 32	****	4.17	4.69	4.69	****
 Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful Were there enough proctors for all the students 	66 66	0	1	1	2	0	1 1	2.80	****/ 32 ****/ 21		4.25 4.50	4.37 4.52	4.67 5.00	****
J. were there enough proctors for all the students	00	U	Τ	U	3	U	Τ	3.00	/ 21		4.50	7.34	5.00	

Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO

Instructor: AKINMADE, DAMIL

Enrollment: 88
Questionnaires: 71

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 186 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	4	A	8	Required for Majors	53	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	32						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	10	С	17	General	0	Under-grad	71	Non-major	71
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES

Enrollment: 170
Questionnaires: 145

PHYSIOLOGY I Baltimore County NN, ES Fall 2007 Page 187 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	2	6		112	4.70	391/1639	4.70	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	6	9	39	88	4.47	567/1639	4.47	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	10	44	85	4.48	560/1397	4.48	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	83	2	3	6	16	31	4.22	822/1583	4.22	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	11	3	6	25	39	55	4.07	722/1532	4.07	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		112	1	0	7	8	11		****/1504	****	3.75	4.05	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	6	15	36	81	4.34		4.34	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	4 27	3 4	1 1	0	0 14	83 33	54 66	4.37	1265/1635	4.37 4.43	4.91 3.91	4.65 4.08	4.63	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	4	Τ.	U	14	33	00	4.43	473/1579	4.43	3.91	4.08	4.14	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	10	28	98	4.60	684/1518	4.60	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	3		125	4.87	648/1520	4.87	4.59	4.70	4.78	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	3	11	30	91	4.55	547/1517	4.55	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	3	3	2	7	21	104	4.61	511/1550	4.61	4.14	4.22	4.33	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	29	3	5	10	26	60	4.30	428/1295	4.30	4.03	3.94	4.07	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	106	0	4	4	8	6	17	3.72	994/1398	3.72	3.87	4.07	4.14	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	107	0	0	3	11	8	16		1007/1391	3.97	4.24	4.30	4.35	3.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	92	0	3	6	7	15	22		1043/1388	3.89	4.16	4.28	4.37	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	107	22	0	3	4	5	4	3.63	****/ 958	***	3.64	3.93	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	134	0	1	2	0	1	7	4 00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	136	0	0	0	0	3	6		****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	136	0	1	1	1	1	5		****/ 215	****	4.49	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	136	5	0	1	0	1	2		****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.08	****
									,					
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work	1 4 4	0	•	•	•	•	-	F 00	50	als als als als	als als als als	4 0 4	4 50	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 53 ****/ 42	****	****	4.05 4.75	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	144 144	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 37	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	144	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	144	U	U	U	U	U	Τ.	5.00	/ 32			4.50		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES

Enrollment: 170
Questionnaires: 145

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 187 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	42	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	31
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	В	47						
56-83	17	2.00-2.99	14	C	19	General	9	Under-grad	143	Non-major	114
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	35	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	10	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	jh
				P	2			responses to	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	96				
				?	9						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0101 University of Maryland Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 188

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

TIID CT accor.	THE TOCIMENT,	no (insti. A)		2007	
Enrollment:	22				
Questionnaires:	18		Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

								Fr	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	1															
1. Dić	d you ga	in ne	w insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	103/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.94
			tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	184/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.82
			estions reflec			1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	216/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.82
4. Dic	d other	evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	9	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	239/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.75
					what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	262/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.63
					o what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	****
			system clearl		ined	1	0	0	0	3			4.41		4.46	4.03	4.16		4.41
			was class canc			1	1	0	0	0			4.88	,	4.97		4.65	4.63	
9. How	w would	you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	241/1579	4.22	3.91	4.08	4.14	4.23
			Lectur																
			ctor's lecture			2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	149/1518	4.57	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.94
			tor seem inter		3	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1520	4.54	4.59	4.70	4.78	5.00
					xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1			4.75	299/1517	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.34	
			s contribute t		-	1	1	0	0	0	_			122/1550	4.09		4.22		4.94
5. Did	d audiov	risual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	11	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	346/1295	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.07	4.40
			Discus																
					what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0			****/1398		3.87			****
					d to participate	17	0	1	0	0	0			****/1391	4.15		4.30	4.35	****
3. Dio	d the ir	struc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	****
			Labora	-															
				_	f the material	4	0	0	0	1			4.71	37/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	4.71
					ground information	5	0	0	0	1			4.77	38/ 240	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.47	
		_			or lab activities	5	0	0	0	0			4.77	63/ 219	4.78		4.44		4.77
4. Did	d the la	b ins	tructor provid	e assis	tance	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	59/ 215	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.43	4.77
					Frequ	ıency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credit	ts Earne	ed	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	 7 (. – – – –)	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	านา	ed fo	 or Ma			0	Graduat		0	 Majo	 r	 5
28-55			1.00-1.99	0	В 4		1000			1.10	⊥ ∪ ر .	_	-	S_aaaac	-	-	.14.70	-	3
56-83			2.00-2.99	3	C 8		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	major	13
84-15			3.00-3.49	5	D 0		001	a	_				-	011001 9		-	2.021		
Grad.)	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	_i h
					P 0									respons				_	-
					I O		Otl	ner				1	.6	_		3			

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0101 University of Maryland
Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore County

Page 189

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore County
Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								-	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sec
		Question	.s 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		Genera	1															
. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	103/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.
. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	184/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.
. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	216/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.
. Did otl	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	9	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	239/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.
. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	262/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.
Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	* *
Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	617/1612	4.46	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.
. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	706/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.63	4.
. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	12	1	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1133/1579	4.22	3.91	4.08	4.14	4.
		Lectur	e															
. Were tl	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1518	4.57	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.
		ctor seem inter			14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1520	4.54	4.59	4.70	4.78	5.
				xplained clearly	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1517	4.44		4.27	4.34	4.
		es contribute t			13	1	1	0	0	2			****/1550			4.22	4.33	
				our understanding	15	0	0	0	0	2			****/1295					
		Discus	sion															
. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	**
				d to participate	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1391		4.24	4.30	4.35	* *
				d open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1388	4.08	4.16		4.37	* *
		Labora	torv															
Did the	e lab ind	crease understa		f the material	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	37/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	4.
			_	ground information	5	0	0	0	1		11		38/ 240	4.75			4.47	
				or lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	63/ 219				4.61	
		structor provid			5	0	0	0	1	1	11		59/ 215				4.43	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
redits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po:	asons				Ту	0.0			Majors	•
										, -								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 4				_				_	_	_	_			
6-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 8		Gei	nera	T				0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	1
34-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0		_						_						
Brad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	L6						
				? 1														

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0102 University of Maryland Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Baltimore County

Page 190

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A) Fall 2007 Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15 Student Cou	rse	Evalu	atio	on Q	uesti	onn	aire							
			Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	508/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	774/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	906/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1010/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	722/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	546/1612	4.46	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	197/1579	4.22	3.91	4.08	4.14	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	989/1518	4.57	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	1074/1520	4.54	4.59	4.70	4.78	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	661/1517	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1077/1550	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.33	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	623/1295	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.07	4.00

	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1207/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	3.25
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1146/1391	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	3.75
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1095/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	3.75
4.	Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	2.60	3.64	3.93	4.00	***
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	62/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	4.45
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	45/ 240	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.47	4.73
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	76/ 219	4.78	4.66	4.44	4.61	4.73
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	181/ 215	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.43	3.91
_	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1.0	^	_	-	_	_	2 00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.08	****

Field Work

1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.04 4.78 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				2	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0102 University of Maryland
Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore County

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 21
Ouestionnaires: 15

Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 191

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 0 0 2 12 4.60 508/1639 4.75 4.36 4.27 4.35 4.60 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 8 6 4.33 774/1639 4.43 4.09 4.22 4.27 4.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 6 6 4.13 906/1397 4.41 4.04 4.28 4.39 4.13 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 9 0 0 1 4 1 4.00 1010/1583 4.29 4.03 4.19 4.28 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 1 1 4 7 4.07 722/1532 4.33 3.80 4.01 4.09 4.07 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1504 3.66 3.75 4.05 4.09 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 3 2 10 4.47 546/1612 4.46 4.03 4.16 4.21 4.47 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 15 5.00 1/1635 4.97 4.91 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/1579 4.22 3.91 4.08 4.14 4.73 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 12 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 ****/1518 4.57 4.39 4.43 4.48 4.36 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/1520 4.54 4.59 4.70 4.78 4.64 12 0 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 12 0 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/1517 4.44 4.07 4.27 4.34 4.45 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 2 0 1 3 3.83 1198/1550 4.09 4.14 4.22 4.33 3.44 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12 2 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1295 3.83 4.03 3.94 4.07 4.00 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 1 1 3.25 1207/1398 3.63 3.87 4.07 4.14 3.25 1 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 2 1 1 3.75 1146/1391 4.15 4.24 4.30 4.35 3.75 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 00 2 1 1 3.75 1095/1388 4.08 4.16 4.28 4.37 3.75 4. Were special techniques successful 10 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 958 2.60 3.64 3.93 4.00 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 0 0 0 2 7 4.45 62/ 224 4.61 4.48 4.10 4.33 4.45 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 45/ 240 4.75 4.44 4.11 4.47 4.73 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 76/ 219 4.78 4.66 4.44 4.61 4.73 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4 0 1 1 2 1 6 3.91 181/ 215 4.40 4.49 4.35 4.43 3.91 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4 10 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 198 **** 3.89 4.18 4.08 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.04 4.78 **** Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6	-					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0102 University of Maryland
Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore County F

Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 21
Ouestionnaires: 15

Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 192 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	508/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	774/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	906/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1010/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	722/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	546/1612	4.46	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.63	5.00
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	2	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	1491/1550	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.33	3.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1207/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1146/1391	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1095/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	2.60	3.64	3.93	4.00	***
T all asset asset														
Laboratory	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	62/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	4.45
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	∠ 1	∠ 1	9	4.45	45/ 240	4.01	4.48	4.10	4.33	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	76/ 219	4.78	4.44	4.11	4.47	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	U	U	U	Τ.		9	4./3	/0/ 219	4./8	4.00	4.44	4.01	4./3

Field Work

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.04 4.78 ****

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4 0 1 1 2 1 6 3.91 181/ 215 4.40 4.49 4.35 4.43 3.91

4 10 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 198 **** 3.89 4.18 4.08 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				2	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0103 University of Maryland

Baltimore County ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Title Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 193 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncies	1			tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	482/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	6		1090/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	859/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1010/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	677/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1249/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	802/1612	4.46	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1102/1579	4.22	3.91	4.08	4.14	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	5	6		1175/1518		4.39	4.43	4.48	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	7		1305/1520	4.54	4.59	4.70	4.78	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	3	5		1211/1517	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.34	3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	8		1043/1550	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.33	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	1	4	0	3	3.33	1067/1295	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.07	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	1	3		1171/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	983/1391	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	3	3		1047/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	2.60	3.64	3.93	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	88/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	56/ 240	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.47	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	67/ 219	4.78	4.66	4.44	4.61	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	1	2	8		119/ 215	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.43	4.42
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	9	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar				_		_								
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	***	4.63	4.52	3.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	***	5.00	4.47	2.00	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	***	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 43	***	4.17	4.69	****	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0103

ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Title

FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)

24 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 193 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0103

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

(Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 194

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 16

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 13 4.63 482/1639 4.75 4.36 4.27 4.35 4.63 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 6 4.00 1090/1639 4.43 4.09 4.22 4.27 4.00 0 0 0 6 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 6 7 4.19 859/1397 4.41 4.04 4.28 4.39 4.19 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 4 3 4.00 1010/1583 4.29 4.03 4.19 4.28 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 4 5 6 4.13 677/1532 4.33 3.80 4.01 4.09 4.13 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 8 1 0 3 2 3.43 1249/1504 3.66 3.75 4.05 4.09 3.43 1 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 2 4 8 4.27 802/1612 4.46 4.03 4.16 4.21 4.27 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 1 0 0 0 0 15 5.00 1/1635 4.97 4.91 4.65 4.63 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 4 3 4 4.00 889/1579 4.22 3.91 4.08 4.14 3.92 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Ω Ω Ω 2 3 6 4.36 989/1518 4.57 4.39 4.43 4.48 4.25 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 3 3 6 4.25 1356/1520 4.54 4.59 4.70 4.78 4.30 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 3 2 6 4.08 1036/1517 4.44 4.07 4.27 4.34 3.97 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 2 7 4.17 972/1550 4.09 4.14 4.22 4.33 4.12 3 1 1 0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 3 3.57 943/1295 3.83 4.03 3.94 4.07 3.45 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 3 3.38 1171/1398 3.63 3.87 4.07 4.14 3.38 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 1 4 4.00 983/1391 4.15 4.24 4.30 4.35 4.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 1 0 1 3 3.88 1047/1388 4.08 4.16 4.28 4.37 4. Were special techniques successful 9 5 1 4.00 ****/ 958 2.60 3.64 3.93 4.00 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 0 7 4.33 88/ 224 4.61 4.48 4.10 4.33 4.33 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 Ω Ω 1 9 4.67 56/ 240 4.75 4.44 4.11 4.47 4.67 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 9 4.75 67/ 219 4.78 4.66 4.44 4.61 4.75 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4 0 0 1 1 2 8 4.42 119/215 4.40 4.49 4.35 4.43 4.42 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4 9 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 198 **** 3.89 4.18 4.08 **** 0 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 14 1 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 82 **** 4.63 4.52 3.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.47 2.00 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 0 3.50 ****/ 82 **** 4.13 4.16 4.00 **** Field Work 1 4.50 ****/ 52 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 14 0 4.04 4.78 1 4.50 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.05 4.28 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 14 0 0 1 42 **** **** 4.75 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 14 0 0 1 0 0 2.50 ****/ **** **** 4.58 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 37 14 0 0 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** **** 4.56 **** **** 14 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 0 3.50 ****/ 50 **** 4.33 4.45 3.24 **** 14 0 0 Λ 1 1 14 0 0 3.50 ****/ 32 **** 4.20 4.51 4.33 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 14 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 43 **** 4.17 4.69 14 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.25 4.37 1.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful

14 0 0

0 2 0 0 3.00 ****/ 21 **** 4.50 4.52 3.00 ****

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0103

ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Title Instructor:

Baltimore County (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Page 194 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0104 University of Maryland

Questionnaires: 19

Title Baltimore County ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Instructor:

Page 195 FEB 13, 2008 FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A) Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	aner	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General		_		_	_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	179/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	382/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	392/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	423/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	256/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	958/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	293/1612	4.46	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	255/1579	4.22	3.91	4.08	4.14	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1518	4.57	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1510	4.54	4.59	4.43	4.48	4.50
	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	1/1520	4.44	4.07	4.70	4.76	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1550	4.44	4.14	4.27	4.34	4.76
	5	т 6	1	0	1	1		3.83	783/1295	3.83	4.14	3.94		3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	/	ь	Τ	U	Τ	Τ	3	3.83	/83/1295	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.07	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	477/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	363/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	907/ 958	2.60	3.64	3.93	4.00	2.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	29/ 240	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.47	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	31/ 219	4.78	4.66	4.44	4.61	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	62/ 215	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.43	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.08	****
Frequ	lency	Dis	tribu	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0104 University of Maryland
Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore County

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore Count Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

									_	ncies		_		ructor		Dept		Level	Sect
		Question	is			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	al																
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this cou	rse	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	179/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.89
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goa	ls	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	382/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.63
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the	expected go	als	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	392/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.63
		uations reflect				0	10	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	423/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.5
		eadings contrib				0	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	256/1532		3.80	4.01	4.09	4.6
		signments contr		_	learned	0	10	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	958/1504		3.75	4.05	4.09	3.8
		g system clearl		ained		0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	293/1612		4.03	4.16	4.21	4.6
		was class cand				0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635		4.91		4.63	5.0
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all tead	ching effec	tiveness	12	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1094/1579	4.22	3.91	4.08	4.14	4.2
		Lectur	re																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared		14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	684/1518	4.57	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.8
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	rested :	in the subj	ect	14	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1414/1520	4.54	4.59	4.70	4.78	4.5
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	ed and	explained c	learly	14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	474/1517	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.7
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learne	ed.	12	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	944/1550	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.33	4.6
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your unders	tanding	14	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1295	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.07	3.8
		Discus	ssion																
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you 1	earned	10	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	477/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	4.4
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to parti	cipate	10	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.8
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open dis	cussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	363/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	4.7
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	essful	_		10	4	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	907/ 958	2.60	3.64	3.93	4.00	2.6
		Labora	atorv																
1. Did th	ne lab in	crease understa	-	of the mate	rial	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	5.0
		ded with adequa	_			7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	29/ 240	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.47	4.8
		materials avai				7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	31/ 219	4.78	4.66	4.44	4.61	4.9
	_	structor provid				7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	62/ 215	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.43	4.7
		nts for lab rep			ified	7	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.08	***
					Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	4	Expecte	d Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 28-55	1 2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	1 0	A B	2 8		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	îs	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4		Ger	nera	1				0	IInder-a	rad 1	9	Non-	maior	17

Page 196

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Ĺ	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION Fall 2007

Instructor: MENDELSON, TAMR (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 224 Questionnaires: 101

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 197

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

				Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills	from this course	2	0	0	4	10	37	48	4.30	841/1639	4.30	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the	expected goals	2	0	0	2	17	40	40	4.19	915/1639	4.19	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect th	e expected goals	2	0	2	1	15	43	38	4.15	888/1397	4.15	4.04	4.28	4.26	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the	expected goals	3	30	5	3	14	17	29	3.91	1143/1583	3.91	4.03	4.19	4.24	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute	to what you learned	4	2	5	12	24	28	26	3.61	1176/1532	3.61	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribut	e to what you learned	4	35	3	8	13	16	22	3.74	1059/1504	3.74	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly ex	plained	6	0	1	6	17	31	40	4.08	989/1612	4.08	4.03	4.16	4.12	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelle	d	4	0	1	1	2	2	91	4.87	721/1635	4.87	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall t	eaching effectiveness	19	1	0	2	12	48	19	4.04	871/1579	4.03	3.91	4.08	4.07	4.03
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures we	ll prepared	10	0	1	1	4	23	62	4.58	708/1518	4.55	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem intereste		13	0	0	2	4	19	63	4.63	1087/1520	4.70	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented an	d explained clearly	13	0	0	2	11	26	49	4.39	747/1517	4.33	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to wh	-	10	2	0	3	11	19	56	4.44	729/1550	4.44	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhanc	-	14	1	2	5	8	21	50	4.30	421/1295	4.37	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.37
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute		59	0	3	2	7	11	19	3.98	805/1398	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.98
2. Were all students actively encour	_	59	0	1	1	7	12	21	4.21	847/1391	4.21	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair		58	0	1	0	8	10	24	4.30	802/1388		4.16	4.28		4.30
4. Were special techniques successfu	_	58	12	2	4	5	7	13	3.81	577/ 958			3.93		3.81
	Frequ	iency	, Dis	trik	utic	n									
a 111 a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	-									_					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asor	1S			Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27 10 0.00-0.99 0	A 23		Re	quir	ed f	or M	Major	s	6	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	27

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	 А	23	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	38						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	12	С	11	General	3	Under-grad	101	Non-major	74
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	17	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	s there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	57	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101 University of Maryland Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION Baltimore County

FREELAND, STEPH (Instr. B)

Instructor:

University of Maryland Page 198
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	224				
Questionnaires:	101	Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	es		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	4	10	37	48	4.30	841/1639	4.30	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	17	40	40	4.19	915/1639	4.19	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	15	43	38	4.15	888/1397	4.15	4.04	4.28	4.26	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	30	5	3	14	17	29	3.91	1143/1583	3.91	4.03	4.19	4.24	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	5	12	24	28	26	3.61	1176/1532	3.61	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	35	3	8	13	16	22	3.74	1059/1504	3.74	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	6	17	31	40	4.08	989/1612	4.08	4.03	4.16	4.12	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	1	2	2	91	4.87	721/1635	4.87	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	1	3	3	14	28	23	3.92	1039/1579	4.03	3.91	4.08	4.07	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	2	2	3	15	50	4.51	794/1518	4.55	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	0	1	3	10	56	4.73	943/1520	4.70	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	2	1	13	19	34	4.19	956/1517	4.33	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	1	1	3	9	15	42	4.34	823/1550	4.44	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	4	2	3	7	12	42	4.35	391/1295	4.37	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	59	0	3	2	7	11	19	3.98	805/1398	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.98
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	59	0	1	1	7	12	21	4.21	847/1391	4.21	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	58	0	1	0	8	10	24	4.30	802/1388	4.30	4.16	4.28	4.34	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	58	12	2	4	5	7	13	3.81	577/ 958	3.81	3.64	3.93	3.97	3.81
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asor	ıs			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27 10 0.00-0.99 0 A 23		 Re	 auir	ed f	or M	lajor	 s	6	Graduat	 e	0	Majc		 27

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	А	23	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	38						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	12	C	11	General	3	Under-grad	101	Non-major	74
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	17	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	57	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101 University of Maryland
Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION Baltimore County

Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 224

Questionnaires: 101 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncie	s			tructor	Course	_			
		Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener	 al															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,sk		om this course	2	0	0	4	10	37	48	4.30	841/1639	4.30	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.30
		ctor make clea			2	0	0	2	17	40	40	4.19	915/1639	4.19	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.19
		uestions refle			2	0	2	1	15	43	38	4.15	888/1397	4.15	4.04	4.28	4.26	4.15
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflec	t the ex	spected goals	3	30	5	3	14	17	29	3.91	1143/1583	3.91	4.03	4.19	4.24	3.91
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contri	bute to	what you learned	4	2	5	12	24	28	26	3.61	1176/1532	3.61	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.61
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments cont	ribute t	to what you learned	4	35	3	8	13	16	22	3.74	1059/1504	3.74	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.74
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clear	ly expla	ined	6	0	1	6	17	31	40	4.08	989/1612	4.08	4.03	4.16	4.12	4.08
8. How ma	any times	was class can	celled		4	0	1	1	2	2	91	4.87	721/1635	4.87	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.87
9. How wo	ould you	grade the over	all tead	ching effectiveness	25	2	0	1	10	41	22	4.14	795/1579	4.03	3.91	4.08	4.07	4.03
		Lectu	re															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectur		prepared	23	0	1	1	2	23	51	4.56	733/1518	4.55	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.55
		ctor seem inte			24	0	0	0	4	11	62	4.75	890/1520	4.70	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.70
				explained clearly	25	0	0	0	8	29	39	4.41	726/1517	4.33	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.33
		es contribute			24	1	0	0	7	20	49	4.55	580/1550	4.44	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.44
				our understanding	24	1	1	1	6	21	47	4.47	289/1295	4.37	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.37
		Discu	ggion															
1. Did cl	lass disc			what you learned	59	0	3	2	7	11	19	3.98	805/1398	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.98
				ed to participate	59	0	1	1	7	12	21	4.21	847/1391	4.21	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.21
				nd open discussion	58	0	1	0	8	10	24	4.30	802/1388	4.30	4.16	4.28	4.34	4.30
		echniques succ			58	12	2	4	5	7								3.81
				Frequ	ency	z Dis	trih	ut i o	n									
				11040	iciic j	DID	CLID	acio										
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A 23		Re	 quir	 ed f	or M	ajor	s	6	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	27
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	в 38			-			-						J -		
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	12	C 11		Ger	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 10	1	Non-	-major	74
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	17	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	_j h
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				5	57						
				? 2														

Fall 2007

Page 199

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI

Title Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 335 Questionnaires: 165

University of Maryland Page 200 FEB 13, 2008 Baltimore County Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean	
Genera	 1															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course		8	0	3	2	16	55	81	4.33	814/1639	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		8	0	4	5	31	61	56		1082/1639		4.09	4.22		4.02	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		8	0	3	18	18	60	58	3.97	1018/1397	3.97	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		9	106	3	4	14	12	17	3.72	1282/1583	3.72	4.03	4.19	4.24	3.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		8	21	33	29	26	32	16	2.77	1474/1532	2.77	3.80	4.01	4.05	2.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		l 8	125	3	4	8	8	9	3.50	****/1504	****	3.75	4.05	4.12	***	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		9	2	4	9	20	40	81	4.20	872/1612		4.03	4.16	4.12	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled		9	2	1	0	0		150	4.95	331/1635		4.91	4.65		4.95	
9. How would you grade the overa	ll teaching effectiveness	37	1	3	5	28	54	37	3.92	1022/1579	3.92	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.92	
Lectur	е															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		10	0	1	1	8	32	113	4.65	629/1518	4.65	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		11	0	1	1	5	25	122	4.73	943/1520	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		11	0	2	6	23	56	67	4.17	973/1517	4.17	4.07	4.27		4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		9	1	4	5	13	32	101	4.43	742/1550	4.43	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		16	17	12	10	24	47	39	3.69	882/1295	3.69	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.69	
Discus	sion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned			0	2	1	4	8	7	3.77	****/1398	****	3.87	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			0	1	0	4	6	11	4.18	****/1391	****	4.24	4.30	4.35	***	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	1	1	5	18	11	4.03	****/1388	****	4.16	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful		143	16	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	3.97	****	
Labora	torv															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information			0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities			2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	***	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance		160	2	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.49	4.35	4.21	***	
Semina	r															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme		163	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
Field	Mork															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned		163	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria		163	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 53		****	4.05	4.31	****	
galf parad																
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal			1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32		4.20	4.51	5.00	***	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 43		4.17	4.69	5.00	***	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful			2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	***	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students		162	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	***	
	Freq	quency	Dis	strik	outic	n										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Reasons							Type Majors						
Expected Grades		, 	1/5020112							majors					, 	
00-27 5 0.00-0.99 3 A 36			Required for Majors					S	0	Graduat	Graduate 1			Major		
28-55	0 B 56		Conoral						7	IInder-a	Under-and 164			Non weden		
84-150 20 3.00-3.49	56-83 18 2.00-2.99 7 C 28 84-150 20 3.00-3.49 23 D 2		General						,	onder -g	Under-grad 164 Non-major 1				100	
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 44 F 1			Electives						1	#### -	#### - Means there are not enough					
	P 0									respons	responses to be significant					
I 0				Other					126							

? 5

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

Enrollment:

21 Questionnaires: 19

Page 201 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2007

				Frequencies		s In		Tngt	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	726/1639	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	7	6		1369/1639	3.70	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	888/1397	3.96		4.28	4.26	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	10	7	4.16	891/1583	3.95	4.03	4.19	4.24	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	3	3	5	2		1350/1532	3.33	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	0	9	5	4.13	735/1504	3.50	3.75	4.05	4.12	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	6			1229/1612	3.74	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	889/1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	720/1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	15		925/1520	4.36	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	12	2	4		1358/1517	3.48	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	7	6		1077/1550	3.79		4.22	4.20	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	2	1	6		3.78	825/1295	3.54		3.94		3.78
									0-0,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	675/1398	4.02	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	694/1391	4.11	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	764/1388	3.90	4.16	4.28	4.34	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	885/ 958	3.39	3.64	3.93	3.97	2.83
- 1														
Laboratory	2	0	0	0	0	0		4 50	E1 / 004	4 0 4	4 40	4 10	4 06	4 50
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	51/ 224	4.24	4.48	4.10	4.06	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	125/ 240	3.93	4.44	4.11	4.08	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	4		4.75	67/ 219	4.55	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	62/ 215	4.39	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	6	5	5	3.94	141/ 198	3.49	3.89	4.18	4.04	3.94
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	3.25	4.13	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	4.25	4.63	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	3.25	4.13	4.16	4.08	****
72 -1 1 W1-														
Field Work	1.0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	1 0 1	4 70	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	-	2	0			****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	, 55	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	U	U	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	* * * * *		4.58	4.52	* * * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·														

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 19

GEN GENETICS LAB Baltimore County
, JAMES W Fall 2007

Page 201 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	11							
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	18					
				?	1							

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

23 Questionnaires: 21

Enrollment:

Fall 2007

Page 202 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Frequenc		quencies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	1252/1639	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.28	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	7	6	3.81	1326/1639	3.70	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	8	4.00	973/1397	3.96	4.04	4.28	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	939/1583	3.95	4.03	4.19	4.24	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	4	6	2	3	3.13	1402/1532	3.33	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	7	4	4	3.37	1284/1504	3.50	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	1175/1612	3.74	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	3	1	7	4	3.80	1133/1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	5	11	4 24	1110/1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	7	12		1256/1520	4.36	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	5	8	4		1339/1517		4.07	4.27	4.23	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	8	8		1119/1550	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	4	0	3	5	-		1029/1295	3.54		3.94		3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	625/1398	4.02	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	863/1391	4.11	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	834/1388	3.90	4.16	4.28	4.34	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 958	3.39	3.64	3.93	3.97	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	67/ 224	4.24	4.48	4.10	4.06	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	168/ 240	3.93	4.44	4.11	4.08	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	134/ 219	4.55	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	81/ 215	4.39	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	166/ 198	3.49	3.89	4.18	4.04	3.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	3.25	4.13	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	4.25	4.63	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 78	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	3.25	4.13	4.16	4.08	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 53	****	****	4.04		****
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		0					-		,	****	****		4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20 20	0	1 1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42 ****/ 37	****	****	4.75 4.58	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 32	****	****		4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	U	Τ	U	U	U	U	1.00	****/ 32			4.56	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0			****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	***

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 21

Fall 2007

Page 202 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4							
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	11	
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enougl	h	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	1	Other	18					
				?	2							

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Fall 2007

Page 203 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	23
Ouestionnaires:	21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Frequencies				Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean		Mean
~ 														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	1252/1639	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.28	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	7	6	3.81	1326/1639	3.70	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	8	4.00	973/1397	3.96	4.04	4.28	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	939/1583	3.95	4.03	4.19	4.24	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	4	6	2	3	3.13	1402/1532	3.33	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	7	4	4	3.37	1284/1504	3.50	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.37
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	1175/1612	3.74	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1635	4.97		4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1005/1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	1293/1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	5	8		1331/1520	4.36	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	4	6	4		1260/1517		4.07	4.27	4.23	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	1	4	4	7		1048/1550	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	3	3	2	2		1081/1295	3.54	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.36
Diamondan														
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	625/1398	4.02	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9 11	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	863/1391	4.02	4.24	4.07	4.13	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	834/1388	3.90	4.16	4.28	4.34	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	1	1	0	0	2		****/ 958		3.64	3.93	3.97	****
4. Were special techniques successiur	10	,	Τ.	1	U	U	2	3.43	/ 930	3.39	3.04	3.93	3.91	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	67/ 224	4.24	4.48	4.10	4.06	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	168/ 240	3.93	4.44	4.11	4.08	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	134/ 219	4.55	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	81/ 215	4.39	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	166/ 198	3.49	3.89	4.18	4.04	3.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	3.25	4.13	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	4.25	4.63	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.60	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	3.25	4.13	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
		0		1	0	0	0	2.00	, -	****	****	4.05		****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20 20	0	0 1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation		0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00		****	****	4.75	4.63 4.52	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 32	****	****	4.58		****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	U	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 32			4.50	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 203 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	1	Other	18				
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment:

2.3 Ouestionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 1 0 5 6 9 4.05 1110/1639 4.04 4.36 4.27 4.28 4.05 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 1 0 5 6 9 4.05 1110/1639 4.04 4.36 4.27 4.28 4.05 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 3 1 5 10 2 3.33 1536/1639 3.70 4.09 4.22 4.20 3.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 0 2 6 5 8 3.90 1086/1397 3.96 4.04 4.28 4.26 3.90 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 2 2 5 6 6 3.57 1378/1583 3.95 4.03 4.19 4.24 3.57 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 2 2 3 7 1 5 3.22 1371/1532 3.33 3.80 4.01 4.05 3.22 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 3 1 6 6 4 3.35 1291/1504 3.50 3.75 4.05 4.12 3.35 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 1 4 4 2 9 3.70 1305/1612 3.74 4.03 4.16 4.12 3.70 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 1 19 4.95 397/1635 4.97 4.91 4.65 4.66 4.95 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 2 1 4 3 6 3.63 1257/1579 3.74 3.91 4.08 4.07 3.44 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 1 4 5 11 4.24 1110/1518 4.10 4.39 4.43 4.39 3.98 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 1 7 13 4.57 1136/1520 4.36 4.59 4.70 4.68 4.07 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 3 1 6 5 6 3.48 1358/1517 3.48 4.07 4.27 4.23 3.35 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 3 4 5 8 3.76 1232/1550 3.79 4.14 4.22 4.20 3.44 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 1 0 6 5 7 3.89 738/1295 3.54 4.03 3.94 3.95 3.45 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 3 1 1 3.60 ****/1398 4.02 3.87 4.07 4.13 **** 2 2 3 4.14 903/1391 4.11 4.24 4.30 4.35 4.14 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 2 7 1 3.90 1035/1388 3.90 4.16 4.28 4.34 3.90 4. Were special techniques successful 16 4 0 0 1 1 4.00 ****/ 958 3.39 3.64 3.93 3.97 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9 0 0 1 6 6 4.21 103/224 4.24 4.48 4.10 4.06 4.21 2. Were you provided with adequate background information $9 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 0 0 8 6 4.43 98/ 240 3.93 4.44 4.11 4.08 4.43 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 9 0 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 95/219 4.55 4.66 4.44 4.44 4.64 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 9 0 0 2 2 3 7 4.07 153/ 215 4.39 4.49 4.35 4.21 4.07

Page 204

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	2	1	7	1	2	3.00			3.49	3.89	4.18	4.04	3.00
o. Note requirements for rub reports orearry specifical		_	_	_	•	_	_	3.00	2027	270	5.15	3.03	1.10	1.01	3.00
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	85	3.25	4.13	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	82	4.25	4.63	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	78	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	82	3.25	4.13	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	42		****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****

Fall 2007

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor:

Enrollment: 23

SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland

Page 204 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

Page 205 FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	23			
Questionnaires:	23	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	1110/1639	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	1	5	10	2	3.33	1536/1639	3.70	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	6	5	8	3.90	1086/1397	3.96	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	2	5	6	6	3.57	1378/1583	3.95	4.03	4.19	4.24	3.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	3	7	1	5	3.22	1371/1532	3.33	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	6	6	4	3.35	1291/1504	3.50	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.35
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	3	0	1	4	4	2	9	3.70	1305/1612	3.74	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1		4.95	397/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	2	6	3	1	3.25	1420/1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.44
Lecture	_	_	_	_		_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	4	7			1381/1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	8	4	2		1487/1520	4.36	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	3	7	2			1431/1517	3.48	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	4	4	2			1428/1550	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.54	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	3	1	1	2 60	****/1398	4.02	3.87	4.07	4.13	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	2	3			4.11	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	7	1		1035/1388	3.90	4.16	4.28	4.34	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 958	3.39	3.64	3.93	3.97	3.90 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	-1	U	U	1			4.00	/ 956	3.33	3.04	3.93	3.91	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	103/ 224	4.24	4.48	4.10	4.06	4.21
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	98/ 240	3.93	4.44	4.11	4.08	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	3		4.64	95/ 219	4.55	4.66	4.44		4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	153/ 215	4.39	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.07
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	2	1	7	1	2	3.00	192/ 198	3.49	3.89	4.18		3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	3.25	4.13	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	4.25	4.63	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	3.25	4.13	4.16	4.08	****
T 11 7 1														
Field Work	0.0	0	^	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 52	****	****	4 0 4	4 70	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 53 ****/ 42	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 37 ****/ 32	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	U	U	U	U	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	^ ^ ^ ^	* * * * *	4.56	4.30	* * * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 21	****	4.50		5.00	****

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Title

Instructor: Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 23

(Instr. B)

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad 2	23	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	here are	e not enough	1
				P	0			responses to b	e signi:	ficant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 205

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: SANDOZ, JA

SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 14

Fall 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 206 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	1089/1639	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	5	3.93	1227/1639	3.70	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1063/1397	3.96	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1010/1583	3.95	4.03	4.19	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1212/1532	3.33	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	1	4	3.58	1165/1504	3.50	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	6	2	4	3.62	1354/1612	3.74	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1635	4.97			4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	806/1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	919/1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	8		1136/1520	4.36	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	6	2		1260/1517	3.48	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	912/1550	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	623/1295	3.54	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	929/1398	4.02	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	927/1391	4.11	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	3	3		1130/1388	3.90	4.16	4.28		3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	658/ 958	3.39	3.64	3.93	3.97	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	106/ 224	4.24	4.48	4.10	4.06	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	209/ 240	3.93	4.44	4.11	4.08	3.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	116/ 219	4.55	4.66	4.44		4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	96/ 215	4.39	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	3	1	4	2	3.50	170/ 198	3.49	3.89	4.18	4.04	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	83/ 85		4.13	4.58	4.50	3.25
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	65/ 82		4.63	4.52	4.59	4.25
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	53/ 78	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.60	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	U	1	1	2	0	3.25	69/ 82	3.25	4.13	4.16	4.08	3.25
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Title Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Enrollment:

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 206 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

19 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Title (Instr. B)

Page 207 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor:		(Instr. B)	Fall	-
Enrollment:	19			
Questionnaires:	14		Student Course Evalu	ation Questionnaire

			Frequencies		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	4 07	1089/1639	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	5		1227/1639		4.09	4.27	4.20	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	5		1063/1397		4.04	4.28	4.26	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	4		1010/1583		4.03	4.19	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	3	3	2		1212/1532		3.80	4.01	4.05	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	1	4		1165/1504		3.75	4.05	4.12	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	6	2	4		1354/1612		4.03	4.16	4.12	3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635		4.91	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	3	3	0		1409/1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1347/1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1299/1520	4.36	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	5	3	1	3.18	1436/1517	3.48	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1259/1550	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	1122/1295	3.54	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	929/1398		3.87	4.07	4.13	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	,		4.24	4.30	4.35	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	3	3		1130/1388		4.16	4.28	4.34	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	658/ 958	3.39	3.64	3.93	3.97	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	106/ 224		4.48	4.10	4.06	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	209/ 240		4.44	4.11	4.08	3.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	116/ 219		4.66	4.44		4.55
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	96/ 215		4.49	4.35	4.21	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	3	1	4	2	3.50	170/ 198	3.49	3.89	4.18	4.04	3.50
Seminar	1.0	0	-	0	-		1	2 05	02/ 05	2 05	4 10	4 50	4 50	2 05
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	83/ 85		4.13	4.58	4.50	3.25
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	65/ 82		4.63	4.52	4.59	4.25
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10 10	1	0	0	1 1	2 1	1 1	4.00	53/ 78 ****/ 80		4.50 5.00	4.47	4.60 4.65	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	69/ 82		4.13	4.47 4.16	4.08	3.25
	10	O	U	1	_	2	U	3.23	09/ 02	3.23	1.13	4.10	1.00	3.23
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52		****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53		****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42		****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37		****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced		_												
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32		4.20	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43		4.17	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32		4.25	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	* * * *

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor:

Title

(Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 207 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Title

21

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 19

SANDOZ, JAMES W

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 208 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

						Fr	eane	ncies	2		Tng	tructo:	r	Cours	e Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Ouestions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ra	_	Mean	_	Mean		Mean
		General																
		ew insights,skills		2	0	1	2	3	4	7		1311/				4.27	4.28	3.82
		ctor make clear the		2	0	1	1	5	5	5		1388/		3.70		4.22		3.71
	_	uestions reflect th		2	0	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	1138/	1397	3.96	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.82
		ations reflect the		2	1	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	967/	1583	3.95	4.03	4.19	4.24	4.06
			to what you learned	2	1	2	0	5	5	4		1206/		3.33		4.01	4.05	3.56
		_	te to what you learned	2	1	3	1	3	7	2	3.25	1340/	1504	3.50	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.25
		g system clearly ex	-	2	0	1	3	2	6	5	3.65	1338/	1612	3.74		4.16	4.12	3.65
		was class cancelle		2	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	691/		4.97		4.65	4.66	4.88
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overall t	teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1039/	1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.92
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lectures we	ell prepared	2	0	0	1	5	6	5	3,88	1324/	1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.88
		ctor seem interest		2	0	1	0	0	7	9		1305/		4.36		4.70	4.68	4.35
			nd explained clearly	2	0	1	2	7	2	5		1358/		3.48		4.27	4.23	3.47
		es contribute to wh		2	0	2	2	4	4	5		1340/				4.22		3.47
			ce your understanding	2	4	1	2	0	6	4	3.77	832/		3.54		3.94		3.77
5. Did au	uiovisuai	r techniques emiano	ce your understanding	4	4	_	4	U	0	-1	3.77	032/	1293	3.34	4.03	3.94	3.93	3.77
		Discussion																
			to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	929/	1398	4.02	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.80
		_	raged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	1	2		1192/		4.11		4.30	4.35	3.60
		_	r and open discussion	13	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1292/	1388	3.90	4.16	4.28	4.34	3.17
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques successfu	ul	14	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/	958	3.39	3.64	3.93	3.97	****
		Laborator	V															
1. Did the	e lab ind		ng of the material	8	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	180/	224	4.24	4.48	4.10	4.06	3.73
			background information	8	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64			3.93		4.11	4.08	3.64
_	_	_	le for lab activities	8	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	145/		4.55		4.44		4.36
		structor provide as		8	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	158/				4.35		4.00
		_	s clearly specified	8	1	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	162/				4.18		3.70
1 77		Seminar		1.0	0	^	0	0	1	_	4 00	/	٥٦	2 25	4 12	4 50	4 50	
	_	_	the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/	85	3.25		4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the	e instruc	ctor available for	individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	82	4.25	4.63	4.52	4.59	****
		Field Worl	k															
1. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribute (to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	52	****	****	4.04	4.78	***
2. Did yo	u clearly	y understand your o	evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
		Self Pace	ed															
1. Did se	lf-paced		to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****
	-		-															
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5				Туј	рe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 4		Red	auir	 ed f	or Ma	 aior	 s	0	Gra	 duat	 p	 1	Majo	 or	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0			100	-1011	ca I	O1 110	- J U I	~	•	OI a	uuu C	_	_	1100		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	- •		Gei	nera	1				1	Und	er-g	rad	18	Non-	-major	7
84-150	2 3.00-3.49 4 D 0				001	a	_				_	0110	9-			2.011		•
Grad.					Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	###	# - 1	Means	there a	are not	enous	ah
			P 0												be sigr		_	•
												_ 00.	_ 0110		91			

Other

I

?

0

0

14

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101 University of Maryland Title CELL BIOLOGY Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: BLUMBERG, DAPHN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 159

Ouestionnaires: 49

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 209

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 2 5 19 22 4.20 939/1639 4.20 4.36 4.27 4.28 4.20 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 2 17 17 11 3.67 1404/1639 3.67 4.09 4.22 4.20 3.67 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 4 10 11 18 5 3.21 1337/1397 3.21 4.04 4.28 4.26 3.21 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 39 3 2 1 2 1 2.56 ****/1583 **** 4.03 4.19 4.24 **** 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 1 5 4 7 18 12 3.61 1184/1532 3.61 3.80 4.01 4.05 3.61 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 40 0 2 0 1 2 3.60 ****/1504 **** 3.75 4.05 4.12 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 2 7 7 18 13 3.70 1305/1612 3.70 4.03 4.16 4.12 3.70 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 1 46 4.98 199/1635 4.98 4.91 4.65 4.66 4.98 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 8 18 15 3 3.24 1423/1579 3.25 3.91 4.08 4.07 3.25 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 3 4 14 27 $4.35\ 1000/1518$ $4.34\ 4.39\ 4.39$ $4.39\ 4.39$ 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 4 1 11 13 18 3.85 1211/1517 3.80 4.07 4.27 4.23 3.80 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 5 4 9 14 16 3.67 1274/1550 3.64 4.14 4.22 4.20 3.64 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 5 5 9 28 4.21 497/1295 4.01 4.03 3.94 3.95 4.01 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 38 0 4 1 4 1 1 2.45 ****/1398 **** 3.87 4.07 4.13 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 38 0 1 3 1 6 0 3.09 ****/1391 **** 4.24 4.30 4.35 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 37 0 2 1 4 3 2 3.17 ****/1388 **** 4.16 4.28 4.34 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 36 12 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 958 **** 3.64 3.93 3.97 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 47 0 2 0 0 0 1.00 **** 224 **** 4.48 4.10 4.06 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 47 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 **** 240 **** 4.44 4.11 4.08 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 48 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 5.00 **** 4.33 4.45 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 48 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.20 4.51 5.00 **** 48 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.17 4.69 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 14 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major A 14 B 19 C 4 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 56-83 14 2.00-2.99 5 84-150 9 3.00-3.49 11 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 11 General 1 Under-grad 49 Non-major 23 D 1 F 0 Electives Ω #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 42 ? 3

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

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 210

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 159 Questionnaires: 49 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

CRAIG, NESSLY C (Instr. B)

Instructor:

Questionnaires.		daent cour	. 50	Буат	aacı	OII Q	ucsc	10111	alle	•							
						_	ncie				tructor			_	UMBC		Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Me	an	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General																
1. Did you gain	new insights, skills from this cou	ırse	0	0	1	2	5	19	22	4.20	939/163	39 4.	20	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.20
2. Did the instr	ructor make clear the expected goa	ıls	0	0	2	2	17	17	11	3.67	1404/163	39 3.	67	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.67
3. Did the exam	questions reflect the expected go	als	1	0	4	10	11	18	5	3.21	1337/139	97 3.	21	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.21
4. Did other eva	luations reflect the expected goa	als	1	39	3	2	1	2	1	2.56	****/158	33 **	**	4.03	4.19	4.24	****
5. Did assigned	readings contribute to what you 1	earned	2	1	5	4	7	18	12	3.61	1184/153	32 3.	61	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.61
	ssignments contribute to what you	ı learned	4	40	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	****/150)4 **	**	3.75	4.05	4.12	***
	ng system clearly explained		2	0	2	7	7	18	13	3.70	1305/163	L2 3.	70	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.70
-	s was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	1			199/163			4.91			4.98
9. How would you	grade the overall teaching effec	ctiveness	6	0	1	3	24	14	1	3.26	1420/15	79 3.	25	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.25
	Lecture																
1. Were the inst	ructor's lectures well prepared		3	0	0	2	2	21	21	4.33	1031/15	L8 4.	34	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.34
	ructor seem interested in the subj	iect	3	0	0	1	4	15	26		1247/152			4.59	4.70	4.68	4.5
	naterial presented and explained c		4	0	1	3	14				1260/15			4.07		4.23	3.80
	res contribute to what you learne		4	0	3	6	11				1289/15					4.20	3.6
	al techniques enhance your unders		4	3	2	5	7	13	15	3.81	806/129	95 4.	01	4.03		3.95	4.0
	Discussion																
1 Did alage die	cussions contribute to what you l	earned	38	0	4	1	4	1	1	2 45	****/139	λΩ **	**	3.87	4.07	4.13	***
	lents actively encouraged to parti		38	0	1	3	1	6	0		****/13			4.24	4.30	4.35	***
	cuctor encourage fair and open dis		37	0	2	1	4	3	2		****/138	-		4.16	4.28	4.34	***
	techniques successful	cussion	36	12	0	0	1	0	_		****/ 9!				3.93	3.97	***
	10000000										,						
	Laboratory																
	ncrease understanding of the mate		47	0	2	0	0	0	0		****/ 22			4.48	4.10	4.06	* * *
2. Were you prov	rided with adequate background inf	formation	47	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 2	10 **	**	4.44	4.11	4.08	***
	Self Paced																
1. Did self-pace	ed system contribute to what you l	earned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	50 **	**	4.33	4.45	5.00	***
2. Did study que	stions make clear the expected go	al	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32 **	**	4.20	4.51	5.00	***
3. Were your con	tacts with the instructor helpful	-	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	13 **	* *	4.17	4.69	5.00	***
		Freque	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expecte	ed Grades				Re	ason	g			-	Гуре				Majors	ŧ.
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0 A	14		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Gradua	ate	0)	Majo	r	26
28-55 2	1.00-1.99 0 B 2.00-2.99 5 C	19 4		a	nera	1				1	TTm all a	crac = 1	40		NT	mo i	22
56-83 14	56-83					Τ				1	Under-	-grad	49	'	Non-	major	23
84-150 9 Grad. 0	0		. רקד	ecti					0	шшшш	Moss	a +h		~~ ~~+	02011	-h	
Grad. 0	0		FT6	=CL1	ves				U					re not ifican	enoug	11	
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				O+1	ner				1	2	respor	ises l	o be	: sign	TTTCdl	I L	
	I 0								4	_							

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 0101 Title CELL BIOLOGY LAB

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

University of Maryland Baltimore County Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN Fall 2007

Enrollment: 214

Questionnaires: 199

195 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.25 4.37 5.00 ****

0 0 1 3 4.75 ****/ 21 **** 4.50 4.52 5.00 ****

Page 211 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 199 Student Co	urse	Eval	uatı	.011 Ç	uest	.1011	larre	:						
			Fr	eque	ncie	es.		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	55	0	1	5	10	48	80	4.40	762/1639	4.40	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	55	0	0	4	9	37	94	4.53	486/1639	4.53	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	54	0	2	8	17	60	58	4.13			4.04	4.28	4.26	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	56	4	2	6	12	42	77	4.34			4.03	4.19	4.24	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	55	15	2	6	23	39	59	4.14			3.80	4.01	4.05	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		3	1	10	27	44	56	4.04	802/1504		3.75	4.05	4.12	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	54	0	0	4	14		93	4.49	518/1612		4.03	4.16	4.12	4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	56	0	0	1	0	3	139	4.96			4.91	4.65	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	2	6	72	105		372/1579				4.07	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	79	0	0	0	2	8	110	4.90	213/1518	4.90	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	81	0	0	0	3	22	93	4.76	872/1520	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	80	0	0	1	2	17	99	4.80	251/1517	4.80	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	61	13	2	4	7	23	89	4.54	591/1550	4.54	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	86	37	4	4	13	24	31	3.97	655/1295	3.97	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	164	0	0	2	4	11	18	4.29	****/1398	****	3.87	4.07	4.13	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	164	0	1	1	8	5	20	4.20	****/1391	****	4.24	4.30	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	150	0	2	1	5	22	19	4.12	****/1388	****	4.16	4.28	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	163	15	0	3	7	6	5	3.62	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	3.97	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	125	0	2	0	9	18	45	4.41	74/ 224	4.41	4.48	4.10	4.06	4.41
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	125	0	0	0	5	12	57	4.70	49/ 240	4.70	4.44	4.11	4.08	4.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	126	0	1	0	4	18	50	4.59	108/ 219	4.59	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.59
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	123	2	0	1	10	10	53	4.55	89/ 215	4.55	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	128	0	0	1	7	17	46	4.52	58/ 198	4.52	3.89	4.18	4.04	4.52
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	191	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	193	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	194	2	0	1	0	0	2		****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47		****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	194	3	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	192	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	195	0	1	0	1	0	2		****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	196	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	,	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	195	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	195	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00		****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	196	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	196	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	,	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	195	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50		****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	195	0	0	0	1	2	1		****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69		****

195 0 0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 0101
Title CELL BIOLOGY LAB
Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN

Enrollment: 214
Questionnaires: 199

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 211 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	5
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3	Α	53	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	94
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	69						
56-83	24	2.00-2.99	11	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	199	Non-major	105
84-150	58	3.00-3.49	36	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	34	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	jh
				P	0			responses t	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	129				
				?	10						

Course-Section: BIOL 304 0101
Title PLANT BIOLOGY

PLANT BIOLOGY Baltimore County BEHRENS, PAUL W (Instr. A) Fall 2007

Instructor: BEHRENS, PAUL W (I

Enrollment: 226
Questionnaires: 121

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 212 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
a1														
General	1.0	0	2	2	21	11	1 E	1 12	1042/1620	1 12	1 26	4.27	1 20	1 12
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	10 12	0	2 1	2 8	25	41 40	45 35		1042/1639 1244/1639	4.13 3.92	4.36 4.09	4.27	4.28 4.20	4.13 3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	3	9	31	34	33		1165/1397		4.04	4.28	4.26	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	83	1	1	4	9	13		****/1583	****	4.03	4.19	4.24	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	14	32	20	21	13	8		1509/1532		3.80	4.01	4.05	2.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		102	1	0	2	0	5		****/1504	****	3.75	4.05	4.12	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	5	5	10	19	28	43		1182/1612		4.03	4.16	4.12	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	1	1	0	0		109	4.96	265/1635	4.96	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		1	0	1	15	52	39	4.21			3.91			3.67
one would fee grade one crefair codoning errocerement		_	Ü	_		0.5	0,0		, _ 1, _ 5, ,	3.07	3.71	1.00	1.07	3.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	5	12	93	4.80	360/1518	4.62	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	8	101	4.93	437/1520	4.81	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	1	5	30	71	4.56	523/1517	3.90	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	3	6	18	82	4.61	522/1550	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	13	5	0	10	26	53	4.30	428/1295	4.22	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.22
Discussion			_	_		_								
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	97	0	7	3	2	3	9		****/1398	****	3.87	4.07	4.13	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	97	0	2	2	4	3	13		****/1391	****	4.24	4.30	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	93	0	3	1	4	6	14		****/1388	****	4.16	4.28	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	98	8	3	0	3	1	8	3.73	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	3.97	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	119	1	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	4.06	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	119	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****
5. Here hedebary materials available for las accivities		Ü	Ü	o	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 210		1.00			
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	120	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work				_		_								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	120	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	120	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42		****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	120	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	***	****	4.56	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	120	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 32		4.20	4.51	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32		4.25	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	120	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 21		4.50	4.52	5.00	****
		-	_	-	-	-	-		,					

Course-Section: BIOL 304 0101 University of Maryland Page 212 Title Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 PLANT BIOLOGY Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BEHRENS, PAUL W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 226

Questionnaires: 121 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	40	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	74
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	38						
56-83	22	2.00-2.99	8	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	121	Non-major	47
84-150	42	3.00-3.49	33	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	27	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses t	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	101				
				?	2						

PLANT BIOLOGY

Title Instructor: LU, HUA

Enrollment: 226 Questionnaires: 121

Baltimore County (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Page 213 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	2	2	21	41	45	4.13	1042/1639	4.13	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	1	8	25	40	35		1244/1639		4.09	4.22	4.20	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	3	9	31	34	33	3.77	1165/1397	3.77	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	83	1	1	4	9	13	4.14	****/1583	****	4.03	4.19	4.24	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	14	32	20	21	13	8	2.41	1509/1532	2.41	3.80	4.01	4.05	2.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		102	1	0	2	0	5		****/1504		3.75	4.05	4.12	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	5	5	10	19	28			1182/1612		4.03	4.16	4.12	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	1	1	0	0		109		265/1635		4.91	4.65	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	7	11	55	25	7	3.13	1455/1579	3.67	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	6	7	28	65	4.43	905/1518	4.62	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	6	19	79	4.70	979/1520		4.59	4.43	4.68	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	11	18	26	31	16		1429/1517		4.07	4.70	4.23	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	3	7	8	20	23	45		1171/1550		4.14	4.22	4.20	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	11	4	3	15	20	46		545/1295			3.94		4.22
J. Did additivisual techniques emiance your understanding	22	11	-	J	13	20	10	1.13	343/1293	7.22	1.05	3.94	3.95	1.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	97	0	7	3	2	3	9	3.17	****/1398	****	3.87	4.07	4.13	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	97	0	2	2	4	3	13	3.96	****/1391	****	4.24	4.30	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	93	0	3	1	4	6	14	3.96	****/1388	****	4.16	4.28	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	98	8	3	0	3	1	8	3.73	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	3.97	****
Tabanahana														
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	119	1	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 224	****	1 10	4.10	4.06	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	119	1 0	0	0	0	0	-		****/ 219		4.48 4.66	4.10	4.44	****
5. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	119	U	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	/ 219		4.00	4.44	4.44	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	120	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	120	٥	1	0	0	0	٥	1 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	120 120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53		****	4.04	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	120	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42		****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	120	0	0	0	0	1	U		****/ 37		****	4.73	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	120	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 32		****	4.56	4.30	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	120	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	, 32			1.50	1.50	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	120	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 50		4.33	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	120	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 32		4.20	4.51	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32		4.25	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****

Title PLANT BIOLOGY

Questionnaires: 121

Instructor: LU, HUA Enrollment:

(Instr. B) 226

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 213 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	40	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	74
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	38						
56-83	22	2.00-2.99	8	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	121	Non-major	47
84-150	42	3.00-3.49	33	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	27	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses t	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	101				
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 214

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: BIOL 425 0101

IMMUNOLOGY

ROSENBERG, SUZA

Title

Instructor:

								_	ncies				ructor	Course	_			Sect
		Question	.S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	5	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	456/1639	4.64	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.64
		ctor make clear			5	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	748/1639	4.36	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.36
		uestions reflec		_	7	5	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	4	1	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	960/1583	4.07	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.07
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	950/1532	3.86	3.80	4.01	4.07	3.86
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	5	0	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	1026/1504	3.79	3.75	4.05	4.20	3.79
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	5	0	0	1	0	7	6	4.29	779/1612	4.29	4.03	4.16	4.18	4.29
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		5	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1023/1635	4.64	4.91	4.65	4.72	4.64
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	548/1579	4.36	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.36
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	529/1518	4.71	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.71
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	n the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	437/1520	4.93	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.93
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1042/1517	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.07
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	5	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	814/1550	4.36	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.36
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	7	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	398/1295	4.33	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.33
		Discus																
				what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	3			1074/1398			4.07		
				ed to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2			543/1391					4.60
				nd open discussion	14	0	0	0		1			328/1388			4.28	4.50	
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		14	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	3.64	3.93	4.24	4.00
		Semina	_															
4. Did pr	esentati	ons contribute	to what	you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4		Red		ed fo	or Ma	aior	 s	1	 Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 or	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4						. ,				-) ~		•
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				7	Under-q	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									3				5	
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
<i>y</i> =	=	2.22 2.00	=	P 1								-	respons					,
				I O		Oth	ner					5			9-		-	
				? 1														

Course-Section: BIOL 426 0101

APPR TO MOLECULAR BIOL

Title Instructor: ONEILL, MICHAEL

Enrollment:

21 Questionnaires: 21 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 215 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	4	1	4	1.0	2 00	1252/1639	3.90	4.36	4.27	4.42	3.90
· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	1	0	4	0	1 5	10	10		- ,	3.90	4.36	4.27	4.42	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	9	2	1	2	10	Τ.		1564/1639					
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	-	_	_	3	3	1		1389/1397	2.78	4.04	4.28	4.38	2.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	4	7	5	1		1526/1583	3.06	4.03	4.19	4.31	3.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	6	4		1321/1532	3.35	3.80	4.01	4.07	3.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	2	1	3	3	0		1452/1504	2.78	3.75	4.05	4.20	2.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	Ţ	0	3	0	5	10	2		1441/1612	3.40	4.03	4.16	4.18	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	1		1475/1635	4.05	4.91	4.65	4.72	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	3	4	6	1	3.20	1438/1579	3.20	3.91	4.08	4.21	3.20
T a whoma														
Lecture	2	0	1	2	2	-	4	2 56	1411/1510	2 56	4 20	4 42	4 51	2 56
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	Ţ	3	3	7	4		1411/1518	3.56	4.39	4.43	4.51	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	13		1136/1520	4.58	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	5	./	5	1		1453/1517	3.00	4.07	4.27	4.34	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	6	./	Τ.		1417/1550	3.18	4.14	4.22	4.24	3.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1295	****	4.03	3.94	4.01	****
Discussion														
	_	0	0	1	0	0	_	4 07	616/1398	4 27	3.87	4.07	4.23	4 27
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	•	Τ	0	8	0	4.27	,	4.27				4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0		4	9	4.25	816/1391	4.25	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	4	4	6		1073/1388	3.81	4.16	4.28	4.50	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	5	14	U	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.83	****
		٥	J	Ü	Ŭ		_	3.00	, 03		1.13	1.55	1.00	
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utior	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 430 0101 University of Maryland Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY BUSTOS, MAURICI

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: Enrollment: 46

Questionnaires: 35

I	age	216
FEB	13,	2008
Job	IRBI	3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
beauciie	COULDC	DValaacion	Queberonnurre

			Fre	eque	ncie	es		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	19	12	4.20	951/1639	4.20	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	10	11	14	4.11	1003/1639	4.11	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	13	13	4.06	954/1397	4.06	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	10	8	13	3.83	1212/1583	3.83	4.03	4.19	4.31	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	7	11	16	4.17	648/1532	4.17	3.80	4.01	4.07	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	13	8	10	3.66	1123/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.20	3.66
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	15	16	4.34	706/1612	4.34	4.03	4.16	4.18	4.34
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	29	5	4.11	1447/1635	4.11	4.91	4.65	4.72	4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	16	10	4.09	835/1579	4.09	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	Ο	0	12	23	4.66	616/1518	4.66	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	28	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	8	13	13	4.15	990/1517	4.15	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	18	16	4.43	742/1550	4.43	4.14	4.22		4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	8	10	13	4.16	529/1295	4.16	4.03	3.94	4.01	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	Λ	Λ	5	7	5	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	0	7	9	4.41	686/1391	4.41	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	828/1388	4.26	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	2	1	3	5	2	3.31	794/ 958	3.31	3.64	3.93		3.31
1. Wele special econniques successful		-	_	_	5	3	_	3.31	7517 550	3.31	3.01	3.75	1.21	3.31
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.26	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	17	Required for Majors	1	 Graduate	2	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	33	Non-major	20
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	24	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 442 0101

Title DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY BREWSTER, RACHE (Instr. A)

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 217 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 221 Questionnaires: 102

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quescionnaires.	102	Beddelle Col	arbc	DVal	uucı	011 0	ucbe	. 1 0111	iallo	•						
	Questions		MD	NA	Fr 1	_	ncie 3	es 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect
	Quescions															
	General				_											
	new insights, skills from t		1	0	2	2	12	28	57	4.35			4.36	4.27	4.42	4.3
	uctor make clear the expec		3	0	3	7	18	48	23		1319/1639		4.09	4.22	4.29	3.8
	questions reflect the expe		4	0	5	8	19	35	31		1151/1397		4.04	4.28	4.38	3.8
	luations reflect the expeding readings contribute to what	-	3	76 7	1 14	2 20	10 25	7 16	3		****/1583 1421/1532		4.03	4.19	4.31	
	readings contribute to what ssignments contribute to w		4	85	4	20	25 2	4	16 2		****/1504		3.80	4.01	4.07	3.0
	ng system clearly explaine		4	0.5	9	8	21	23	37		1294/1612		4.03	4.16	4.18	3.7
	es was class cancelled	.u	4	1	0	0	0	3	94		265/1635		4.91	4.65		4.9
-	grade the overall teaching	ng effectiveness		0	4	9	36				1394/1579				4.21	
	Lecture															
1. Were the inst	ructor's lectures well pre	pared	4	0	2	4	16	30	46	4.16	1162/1518	4.41	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.4
	ructor seem interested in t	-	4	0	0	2	9	18	69		1136/1520		4.59	4.70	4.75	4.6
	aterial presented and expl		4	0	3	13	23	30	29		1280/1517			4.27	4.34	4.0
4. Did the lectu	res contribute to what you	learned	2	1	7	6	19	21	46	3.94	1135/1550	4.24	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.2
5. Did audiovisu	al techniques enhance your	understanding	7	11	6	5	11	24	38	3.99	644/1295	4.05	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.0
	Discussion															
	cussions contribute to wha		72	0	8	4	8	6	4		1323/1398		3.87	4.07	4.23	2.8
	lents actively encouraged t		74	0	5	2	8	7	6		1281/1391		4.24	4.30	4.48	3.2
	uctor encourage fair and o	pen discussion	71	0	4	3	7	10	7		1221/1388		4.16	4.28	4.50	3.4
4. Were special	techniques successful		73	21	2	1	0	4	1	3.13	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	4.24	***
1 Did the leb i	Laboratory		0.0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 224	****	4 40	4 10	4 40	***
	ncrease understanding of trided with adequate backgro		98	3 0	0 1	1	0	0	1		****/ 240		4.48	4.10	4.49 4.26	***
	y materials available for		98	1	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 219		4.66			***
	Seminar															
1. Were assigned	topics relevant to the ar	nounced theme	100	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.83	***
	ions contribute to what yo		99	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80		5.00		4.59	***
	Field Work															
1. Did field exp	perience contribute to what	you learned	101	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.84	***
	Self Paced															
_	ed system contribute to wha	_	101	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 50		4.33	4.45	4.85	* * *
	stions make clear the expe		99	0	0	0	1	0	2				4.20	4.51	4.00	* * *
	back/tutoring by proctors h	_	97	2	0	0	3	0	0		****/ 32		4.25		4.67	***
o. Were there en	lough proctors for all the	students	100	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	4.50	***
		Freq	uency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 2	0.00-0.99 1	A 34		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	3	 Graduat	.e	2	Majo	 or	50
28-55 0 56-83 5		Co	nera	1				0	Under-c	mad 10	10	Non	-major	52		
56-83 5 2.00-2.99 10 C 18 84-150 52 3.00-3.49 30 D 0															-	
Grad. 2	3.50-4.00 17	F 0 P 0		El	ecti	ves				2	#### - respons					ſh
	I O		Ot:	her				8	4			J-				

3

Course-Section: BIOL 442 0101

DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY

Title Instructor: EISENMANN, DAVI (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 221 Questionnaires: 102

Baltimore County Fall 2007

FEB 13, 2008

Page 218 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Questions					_	ncie	es			tructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new		com this course	1	0	2	2	12	28	57	4.35	806/1639	4.35	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.35
2. Did the instructo			3	0	3	7	18	48	23		1319/1639	3.82	4.09	4.22	4.29	3.82
3. Did the exam ques		_	4	0	5	8	19	35	31		1151/1397	3.81	4.04	4.28	4.38	3.81
4. Did other evaluat			3	76	1	2	10	7	3	3.39	****/1583	****	4.03	4.19	4.31	****
5. Did assigned read	lings contribute to	what you learned	4	7	14	20	25	16	16	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.80	4.01	4.07	3.00
6. Did written assig	nments contribute	to what you learned	3	85	4	2	2	4	2	2.86	****/1504	****	3.75	4.05	4.20	****
7. Was the grading s	ystem clearly expl	ained	4	0	9	8	21	23	37	3.72	1294/1612	3.72	4.03	4.16	4.18	3.72
8. How many times wa	s class cancelled		4	1	0	0	0	3	94	4.97	265/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.72	4.97
9. How would you gra	de the overall tea	ching effectiveness	19	0	2	0	11	35	35	4.22	702/1579	3.77	3.91	4.08	4.21	3.77
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct			9	0	1	0	7	14	71	4.66	616/1518	4.41	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.41
2. Did the instructo			7	0	0	0	4	15	76	4.76	890/1520	4.66	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.66
3. Was lecture mater	_		7	0	2	4	8	30	51	4.31	833/1517	4.00	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures			6	1	1 2	3	5	21	65	4.54	603/1550	4.24	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.24
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance	your understanding	9	14	2	6	9	26	36	4.11	569/1295	4.05	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.05
	Discussion				_											
1. Did class discuss		-	72	0	8	4	8	6	4		1323/1398	2.80	3.87	4.07	4.23	2.80
2. Were all students			74	0	5	2	8	7	6		1281/1391	3.25	4.24	4.30	4.48	3.25
3. Did the instructo	_	ind open discussion	71	0 21	4	3 1	7 0	10	7		1221/1388		4.16	4.28	4.50	3.42
4. Were special tech	niques successiui		73	21	2	Т	U	4	1	3.13	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	4.24	^ ^ ^ ^
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab incre			98	3	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	4.49	****
2. Were you provided	_	_		0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.26	****
3. Were necessary ma	terials available	for lab activities	98	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.42	****
	Seminar															
1. Were assigned top			100	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.83	****
4. Did presentations	contribute to wha	it you learned	99	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****
	Field Work															
1. Did field experie	nce contribute to	what you learned	101	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.84	****
	Self Paced															
 Did self-paced sy 	stem contribute to	what you learned	101	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.85	****
Did study questic			99	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/		-	97	2	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough	proctors for all	the students	100	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	4.50	****
		Freq	uency	Dis Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ns			Ту	pe			Majors	;

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	34	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	2	Major	50
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	38						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	10	C	18	General	0	Under-grad	100	Non-major	52
84-150	52	3.00-3.49	30	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	84				
				2	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 451 0101 University of Maryland Title NEUROBIOLOGY Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: LIN, WEIHONG (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 30

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 219

Job IRBR3029

					Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	1	2	4	22	4.62	482/1639	4.62	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.62
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	3	11	15	4.41	- ,		4.09	4.22	4.29	4.41
		uestions reflec			2	0	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	,		4.04	4.28	4.38	4.43
		uations reflect			1	0	0	0	4	10	15	4.38	640/1583		4.03	4.19	4.31	
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48			3.80	4.01	4.07	4.48
	_	_		o what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	7	16	4.37	,		3.75	4.05	4.20	4.37
		g system clearl		2	3	0	0	3	2	4	18	4.37	- ,		4.03	4.16	4.18	4.37
	_	was class canc		.11100	3	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1635		4.91	4.65	4.72	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	4	0	0	2	-	10	11		772/1579		3.91		4.21	
	2			J									,					
		Lectur	-															
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	4	7	18	4.48		3 4.49		4.43	4.51	4.49
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	750/1520	4.84	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.84
		_		explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	11	11	4.03	1065/1517	4.18	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.18
		es contribute t		-	1	0	0	1	4	5	19	4.45	716/1550	4.52	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.52
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	0	0	5	6	17	4.43	329/1295	4.41	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.41
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	590/1398	3 4.29	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.29
				ed to participate	13	0	0	0	1	5		4.59	557/1391		4.24	4.30	4.48	4.59
				d open discussion	13	0	0	2	0	3		4.47				4.28	4.50	
		echniques succe			13	4	0	1	1	4			325/ 958				4.24	
		m/ - 1 4	r.r1-															
4. To wha	t dearee	Field could you disc		ır evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	7 ****	****	4.58	4.73	****
11 10 1110	.o dogree	ooula you also	ubb 700		2,	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ū	Ü	3.00	, 3.			1.50	1.75	
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			ТΣ	тре			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Re	guir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	1	Graduat	 :e	 5	Majo	 or	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6		_										3 -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C 3		Ge:	nera	1				8	Under-c	rad 2	25	Non-	-major	23
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	1	D 0													3	
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	P 0												respons				_	•
	I O					Ot:	her				1	.4			5-			
				? 1							_							

Course-Section: BIOL 451 0101 University of Maryland Page 220 Title NEUROBIOLOGY Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYLL (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 30

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 1 2 4 22 4.62 482/1639 4.62 4.36 4.27 4.42 4.62 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 3 11 15 4.41 667/1639 4.41 4.09 4.22 4.29 4.41 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 0 0 4 8 16 4.43 632/1397 4.43 4.04 4.28 4.38 4.43 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 4 10 15 4.38 640/1583 4.38 4.03 4.19 4.31 4.38 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 3 8 16 4.48 356/1532 4.48 3.80 4.01 4.07 4.48 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 0 3 7 16 4.37 514/1504 4.37 3.75 4.05 4.20 4.37 7. Was the grading system clearly explained
8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 3 2 4 18 4.37 669/1612 4.37 4.03 4.16 4.18 4.37 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 0 27 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.91 4.65 4.72 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 2 11 13 4.42 473/1579 4.29 3.91 4.08 4.21 4.29 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 3 7 16 4.50 807/1518 4.49 4.39 4.43 4.51 4.49 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 1 2 24 4.85 674/1520 4.84 4.59 4.70 4.75 4.84 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 3 12 12 4.33 800/1517 4.18 4.07 4.27 4.34 4.18 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 2 7 18 4.59 533/1550 4.52 4.14 4.22 4.24 4.52 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 1 0 0 5 6 15 4.38 361/1295 4.41 4.03 3.94 4.01 4.41 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 1 7 8 4.29 590/1398 4.29 3.87 4.07 4.23 4.29 1 5 11 4.59 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 557/1391 4.59 4.24 4.30 4.48 4.59 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 2 0 3 12 4.47 674/1388 4.47 4.16 4.28 4.50 4.47 4. Were special techniques successful 13 4 0 1 1 4 7 4.31 325/ 958 4.31 3.64 3.93 4.24 4.31 Field Work 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations $29 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 3.00 \, ****/ \, 37 \quad **** \quad 4.58 \quad 4.73 \quad ****$ Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	25	Non-major	23
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 453 0101 University of Maryland Page 221 Title PHYSIOL BASES OF BEHAV Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007

Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	196/1639	4.88	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	393/1639	4.63	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	196/1397	4.86	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	155/1583	4.88	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	469/1532	4.38	3.80	4.01	4.07	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	275/1504	4.63	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.03	4.16	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	706/1635	4.88	4.91	4.65	4.72	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1579	4.75	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.59	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	109/1295	4.80	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	3.64	3.93	4.24	4.67

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

Course-Section: BIOL 476 0101 University of Maryland Page 222
Title ANTIBOTICS Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: LOVETT, PAUL S Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	41		
Questionnaires:	27	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

	Questions						Fr	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did vo	ou gain ne	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this source	0	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	518/1639	4.59	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.59
		ctor make clear			1	0	1	4	6	9	6		1455/1639		4.09	4.22	4.29	3.58
		uestions reflec	-		0	0	0	3	5	10	9		1063/1397		4.04	4.28		3.93
		uations reflect			0	0	0	2	4	9	12	4.15	900/1583		4.03	4.19	4.31	4.15
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	8	13		607/1532		3.80	4.01	4.07	4.22
				what you learned	1	1	1	3	4	9	8		1010/1504		3.75	4.05	4.20	3.80
		g system clearl			0	1	6	2	6	4	8		1479/1612		4.03	4.16	4.18	3.23
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1635		4.91	4.65		5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	2	0	1	3	9	5	7		1289/1579		3.91	4.08	4.21	
J. 110	Julu 70u s			ing cricocryches	_	Ü	-	5		J		3.30	1200, 1070	3.30	3.72	1.00		3.30
1 Were t	-he instri	Lectur actor's lecture	-	repared	1	0	0	5	5	7	9	3 77	1364/1518	3.77	4.39	4.43	4.51	3.77
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	6			979/1520			4.70		4.70
				plained clearly	0	0	1	5	9	5			1369/1517		4.07	4.27		3.44
		es contribute t			0	0	1	4	8	5			1289/1550		4.14	4.22		3.63
			-	our understanding	0	9	3	5	1	5			1146/1295					
3. 21d do	4410111144	2 000111114400 011	riarioc 7	our understanding	Ü		J	5	_		-	3.11	1110, 12,0	3.11	1.03	3.31	1.01	3.11
		Discus																
				what you learned	15	0	1	2	3	1	5	3.58	1080/1398		3.87	4.07	4.23	3.58
				d to participate	14	0	0	1		1	7	4.08	950/1391	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.08
				d open discussion	15	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	834/1388	4.25		4.28	4.50	4.25
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		14	10	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	4.24	***
		Semina	r															
4. Did pr	resentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Τv	pe			Majors	:
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	4	Majo	r	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9		~		,			_	0	1					1.0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 4		Ger	nera	T			1	.2	Under-g	rad 2	13	Non-	major	10
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D 0														
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### -				_	jh
	P 0					0.1					_	-	respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
	I 0					Oth	ner				1	.1						
				? 5														

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101

EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES

Title Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 223

			Fr	eque:	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	222/1639	4.85	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	241/1639	4.77	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	487/1397		4.04	4.28	4.38	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	228/1583	4.77	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	317/1532		3.80	4.01	4.07	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	506/1504	4.38	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	756/1612		4.03	4.16	4.18	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	352/1579	4.43	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	670/1518	4.61	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.84	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	371/1517	4.68	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	242/1550	4.76	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	167/1295	4.66	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	309/1398	4.70	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	143/ 958	4.70	3.64	3.93	4.24	4.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	27/ 224	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.49	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	32/ 240	4.80	4.44	4.11	4.26	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	85/ 219	4.70	4.66	4.44	4.42	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	33/ 215	4.90	4.49	4.35	4.28	4.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	91/ 198	4.30	3.89	4.18	4.21	4.30
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.02	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 2	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad 13	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0					
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means th	nere are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to be	significant	
				I	0	Other	10			
				?	1					

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101 University of Maryland

EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES

Title Instructor: MENDELSON, TAMR (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 224

	Questions					NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 544		Genera			2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4 05	222/1620	4 05	1 26	4 07	4 40	4 05
-	_	insignts,ski or make clear		m this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	11 10	4.85	222/1639 241/1639	4.85 4.77	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.85 4.77
		stions reflec			2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	487/1397	4.54	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.54
		tions reflect			2	0	0	0	1	1	-	4.77	228/1583	4.77	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.77
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	317/1532	4.54	3.80	4.01	4.07	4.54
				o what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	506/1504	4.38	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.38
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	756/1612	4.31	4.03	4.16	4.18	4.31
8. How man	y times w	as class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you gr	ade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	5	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	889/1579	4.43	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.43
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	e instruc	tor's lecture	s well	prepared	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	807/1518	4.61	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.61
		or seem inter		_	6	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	855/1520	4.84	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.84
		_		xplained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1		4.63	451/1517	4.68	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.68
		contribute t			7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	500/1550	4.76	4.14	4.22		4.76
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	7	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	155/1295	4.66	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.66
		Discus																
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	309/1398	4.70	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.70
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.90
		-		d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.80
4. Were sp	ecial tec.	hniques succe	sstul		5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	143/ 958	4.70	3.64	3.93	4.24	4.70
		Labora	-		_		_			_								
			_	f the material	5	0	0	0	0	2		4.80	27/ 224	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.49	4.80
_	_	_		ground information	5	0	0	0	0 1	2	8	4.80	32/ 240	4.80	4.44	4.11	4.26	4.80
		ateriais avai ructor provid		or lab activities	5 5	0	0	0	0	1	8 9	4.70	85/ 219 33/ 215	4.70 4.90	4.66 4.49	4.44	4.42	4.70 4.90
				early specified	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	91/ 198	4.30	3.89	4.18	4.20	4.30
		Semina																
1 Were as	saigned to			announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5 00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.83	****
				ividual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.49	****
				what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.56	****
	_	s contribute		-	12	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****
_		r grading mad		-	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.02	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons				Туј	oe .			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduate	9	2	Majo	r	9
28-55	0 0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 1	В 6 С 1		Com	neral	1				2	IIndox	rad 1	2	Non	mo dos	6
56-83 84-150	0 5	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	3	D 0		Ger	ıera.	L				4	Under-g	.au I	.3	MOIJ-	-major	O
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El-	ectiv	zes.				1	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enous	h.
orau.	P 0				11.0						-	response				_		
	I 0					Oth	ner				1	0	105501190					
	I 0 ? 1						-											

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101

EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. C)

15 Questionnaires: 15

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 225 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie:	S 1	E	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions								Mean	Ralik	Mean			Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	222/1639	4.85	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	241/1639	4.77	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	487/1397	4.54	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	228/1583	4.77	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	317/1532	4.54	3.80	4.01	4.07	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	506/1504	4.38	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	756/1612	4.31	4.03	4.16	4.18	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	302/1579	4.43	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	708/1518	4.61	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	491/1520	4.84	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	405/1517	4.68	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	253/1550	4.76	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	265/1295	4.66	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.66
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	309/1398	4.70	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	143/ 958	4.70	3.64	3.93	4.24	4.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	27/ 224	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.49	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	32/ 240	4.80	4.44	4.11	4.26	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	85/ 219	4.70	4.66	4.44	4.42	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	33/ 215	4.90	4.49	4.35	4.28	4.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	91/ 198	4.30	3.89	4.18	4.21	4.30
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.02	****
Frequ	ency	, Dis	trib	ut i ou	n									

Credits Earned		Carned Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101

EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES

Title Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 226

Questionna	ires: 1	.5		Student Cou	ırse	Evalı	uatio	on Qı	ıesti	onn	aire	!						
			Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4									Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	ļ		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	222/1639	4.85	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.85
2. Did the	instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	241/1639	4.77	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.77
3. Did the	exam qu	estions reflect	. the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	487/1397	4.54	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.54
		ations reflect			2	0	0	0	1	1		4.77			4.03	4.19	4.31	4.77
5. Did ass	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	317/1532		3.80	4.01	4.07	4.54				
6. Did wri	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	506/1504		3.75	4.05	4.20	4.38				
		g system clearly		ned	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	756/1612			4.16		4.31
		was class cance		ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635		4.91	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How wou	10	0	0	U	Ü	2	3	4.60	283/1579	4.43	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.43				
		ctor's lectures			11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	454/1518	4.61	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.61
		ctor seem intere		_	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	890/1520		4.59	4.70	4.75	4.84
				plained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75			4.07		4.34	
		es contribute to			11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	351/1550		4.14	4.22	4.24	
5. Did aud	iovisual	techniques enh	ance yo	ur understanding	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1295	4.66	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.66
1. Did clas	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	309/1398	4.70	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.70				
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.90
				open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388		4.16	4.28	4.50	4.80
4. Were spe	ecial te	chniques succes	sful		5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	143/ 958	4.70	3.64	3.93	4.24	4.70
		Laborat	ory															
1. Did the	lab inc	rease understan	ding of	the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	27/ 224	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.49	4.80
2. Were you	u provid	led with adequat	e backg	round information	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	32/ 240	4.80	4.44	4.11	4.26	4.80
				r lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	85/ 219	4.70	4.66	4.44	4.42	4.70
		structor provide			5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	33/ 215	4.90	4.49	4.35	4.28	4.90
5. Were re	quiremen	nts for lab repo	rts cle	arly specified	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	91/ 198	4.30	3.89	4.18	4.21	4.30
		Seminar	•															
1. Were as:	signed t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.83	* * * *
2. Was the	instruc	tor available f	or indi	vidual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.49	***
	_	-		hat you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 78		4.50	4.47	4.56	***
		ons contribute t		you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	,		5.00	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were cr	iteria f	for grading made	clear		12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.02	***
	Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	n												
Credits Ea	rned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Tτ	ре			Majors			
00-27	A 5 B 6		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	2	Majo	or	9			
28-55 56-83	0 0	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 1	В 6 С 1		General						2	Under-grad 13			Non-major		6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		Gel	ıcı a.	L		2		4	onder-grad 13			IVOII-IIIA JUI		U
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	zes.				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
91au. 2 3.30-4.00 4 F 0												_	respons				_	
				T 0		0+1					1	0	10050110		- ~-91			

Other

10

I 0

1

?

Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB Instructor:

Enrollment:

Baltimore County WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A) Fall 2007

8 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 227 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	214/1639	4.86	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	445/1639		4.09	4.22	4.26	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	767/1397		4.04	4.28	4.37	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	402/1583		4.03	4.19	4.31	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	1		1421/1532		3.80	4.01	4.10	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	313/1504		3.75	4.05	4.29	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	934/1612		4.03	4.16	4.27	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635			4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	496/1579		3.91	4.08	4.17	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	529/1518		4.39	4.43	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520		4.59	4.70	4.79	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	510/1517		4.07	4.27	4.32	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0		4.71	401/1550			4.22	4.23	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	329/1295	4.30	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1398		3.87	4.07	4.22	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	441/1391		4.24	4.30	4.47	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1388		4.16	4.28	4.49	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	3.64	3.93	4.01	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	23/ 224	4.86	4.48	4.10	4.43	4.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	47/ 240	4.71	4.44	4.11	3.96	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	110/ 219	4.57	4.66	4.44	4.23	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	70/ 215	4.71	4.49	4.35	4.72	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	86/ 198	4.33	3.89	4.18	4.74	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.13	4.58	4.58	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.63	4.52	4.74	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.50	4.47	4.52	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80		5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.13	4.16	4.37	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.78	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	37/ 50	4.33	4.33	4.45	4.39	4.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	20/ 32	4.20	4.20	4.51	4.50	4.20
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	35/ 43	4.17	4.17	4.69	4.61	4.17
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	22/ 32	4.25	4.25	4.37	4.31	4.25
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	15/ 21	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.42	4.50

Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB

Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 227 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

.OL 035L 0101

Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB
Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 228 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	-ane	ncie	q		Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	214/1639	4.86	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	445/1639	4.57	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	767/1397	4.29	4.04	4.28	4.37	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	402/1583	4.57	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.80	4.01	4.10	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	313/1504	4.57	3.75	4.05	4.29	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	934/1612	4.14	4.03	4.16	4.27	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1133/1579	4.10	3.91	4.08	4.17	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4 29	1069/1518	4.50	4.39	4.43	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	4		1256/1520		4.59	4.70	4.79	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	854/1517		4.07	4.27	4.32	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14			4.14	4.22	4.23	4.43
	0	1	0	0	2	1	_							
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	Τ	U	U	2	1	3	4.17	529/1295	4.30	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1398		3.87	4.07	4.22	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	441/1391		4.24	4.30	4.47	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1388	4.71	4.16	4.28	4.49	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	3.64	3.93	4.01	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	23/ 224	4.86	4.48	4.10	4.43	4.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	47/ 240		4.44	4.11	3.96	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	110/ 219		4.66	4.44	4.23	4.57
						2								
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0 1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	70/ 215		4.49	4.35	4.72	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	U	Τ	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	86/ 198	4.33	3.89	4.18	4.74	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85		4.13	4.58	4.58	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.63	4.52	4.74	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.50	4.47	4.52	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.13	4.16	4.37	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42		****	4.75	4.78	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32		****	4.56	4.59	****
or produced morp for ourly out rectar deservicing	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 32			1.50	1.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	37/ 50	4.33	4.33	4.45	4.39	4.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	20/ 32	4.20	4.20	4.51	4.50	4.20
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	35/ 43	4.17	4.17	4.69	4.61	4.17
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	22/ 32	4.25	4.25	4.37	4.31	4.25
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	15/ 21	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.42	4.50

Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB

Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 228 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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