

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL
 Enrollment: 287
 Questionnaires: 222

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 174
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	25	25	49	64	54	3.45	1554/1670	3.45	4.26	4.31	4.23	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	21	28	49	73	45	3.43	1532/1666	3.43	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	1	19	25	44	72	53	3.54	1267/1406	3.54	4.09	4.32	4.31	3.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	51	18	19	51	47	31	3.33	1514/1615	3.33	4.05	4.24	4.17	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	10	11	4	26	76	89	4.11	790/1566	4.11	4.05	4.07	4.03	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	76	23	14	39	33	30	3.24	1404/1528	3.24	3.88	4.12	4.00	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	4	20	40	54	59	37	3.25	1541/1650	3.25	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	3	0	0	1	2	208	4.98	135/1667	4.98	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	39	3	26	25	68	48	13	2.98	1539/1626	2.98	3.86	4.11	4.07	2.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	8	12	42	68	86	3.98	1294/1559	3.98	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	5	5	25	48	133	4.38	1340/1560	4.38	4.57	4.72	4.68	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	20	39	62	53	42	3.27	1457/1549	3.27	4.10	4.31	4.32	3.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	2	33	31	50	50	50	3.25	1444/1546	3.25	4.10	4.32	4.32	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	19	17	48	58	65	3.64	970/1323	3.64	3.92	4.00	3.91	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	49	0	19	23	37	43	51	3.49	1110/1384	3.49	4.02	4.10	3.92	3.49
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	48	0	5	11	22	47	89	4.17	902/1378	4.17	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	51	0	11	8	31	49	72	3.95	1016/1378	3.95	4.11	4.31	4.08	3.95
4. Were special techniques successful	51	7	16	6	35	55	52	3.74	638/ 904	3.74	3.98	4.03	3.94	3.74
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	216	2	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 232	****	4.52	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	218	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 239	****	4.47	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	218	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	4.67	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	218	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 231	****	4.49	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	218	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	4.35	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	218	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	218	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	219	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	220	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	220	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	220	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	220	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	220	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	220	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	220	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	220	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	220	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	220	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	220	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL
 Enrollment: 287
 Questionnaires: 222

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 174
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	84	0.00-0.99	1	A	65	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	0	Major	59
28-55	35	1.00-1.99	0	B	68						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	22	C	40	General	6	Under-grad	222	Non-major	163
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	32	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	66	F	3	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	157				
				?	4						

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: OMLAND, KEVIN E
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 175
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1162/1670	4.10	4.26	4.31	4.23	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1435/1666	3.70	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1186/1406	3.80	4.09	4.32	4.31	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	1	2	4	3.70	1356/1615	3.70	4.05	4.24	4.17	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1039/1566	3.88	4.05	4.07	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	631/1528	4.33	3.88	4.12	4.00	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	1079/1650	4.10	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1388/1667	4.22	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1384/1626	3.50	3.86	4.11	4.07	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1136/1559	4.29	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.86	4.57	4.72	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1070/1549	4.14	4.10	4.31	4.32	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1361/1546	3.57	4.10	4.32	4.32	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1323	****	3.92	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1216/1384	3.20	4.02	4.10	3.92	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	264/1378	4.89	4.22	4.29	4.09	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	621/1378	4.56	4.11	4.31	4.08	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	704/ 904	3.57	3.98	4.03	3.94	3.57

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 176
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	8	6	8	4.00	1216/1670	3.54	4.26	4.31	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	5	8	3.73	1424/1666	3.55	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	3	5	1	7	3.00	1343/1406	3.42	4.09	4.32	4.31	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	4	8	6	3.64	1399/1615	3.60	4.05	4.24	4.17	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	6	7	7	3.90	1010/1566	3.76	4.05	4.07	4.03	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	7	5	7	3.64	1217/1528	3.48	3.88	4.12	4.00	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	4	6	7	3.64	1417/1650	3.63	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	897/1667	4.59	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	12	4	2	3.25	1491/1626	3.09	3.86	4.11	4.07	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	1280/1559	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	9	9	4.23	1418/1560	4.08	4.57	4.72	4.68	4.23
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	5	4	10	3.95	1191/1549	3.51	4.10	4.31	4.32	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	8	7	3.73	1305/1546	3.42	4.10	4.32	4.32	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	3	0	4	5	8	3.75	917/1323	3.45	3.92	4.00	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1033/1384	3.19	4.02	4.10	3.92	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1247/1378	3.08	4.22	4.29	4.09	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	1177/1378	3.18	4.11	4.31	4.08	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 904	3.38	3.98	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	76/ 232	4.12	4.52	4.19	4.25	4.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	105/ 239	4.02	4.47	4.21	4.35	4.42
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	79/ 230	4.44	4.67	4.44	4.58	4.74
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	51/ 231	4.07	4.49	4.31	4.45	4.84
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	114/ 218	3.92	4.35	4.18	4.47	4.26
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 176
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	3	3	4	5	1	2.88	1636/1670	3.54	4.26	4.31	4.23	2.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	3	2	8	1	2	2.81	1635/1666	3.55	4.13	4.27	4.30	2.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	6	3	2	1	4	2.63	1393/1406	3.42	4.09	4.32	4.31	2.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	5	4	2	4	3.19	1547/1615	3.60	4.05	4.24	4.17	3.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	4	4	3	3	3.06	1467/1566	3.76	4.05	4.07	4.03	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	3	5	3	1	2.63	1504/1528	3.48	3.88	4.12	4.00	2.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	1	1	6	2	3	3	3.07	1572/1650	3.63	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1112/1667	4.59	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	3	0	9	3	0	2.80	1574/1626	3.09	3.86	4.11	4.07	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	2	3	1	3	6	3.53	1457/1559	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	2	1	3	4	5	3.60	1519/1560	4.08	4.57	4.72	4.68	3.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	2	4	3	3	3	3.07	1485/1549	3.51	4.10	4.31	4.32	3.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	4	2	2	2	5	3.13	1463/1546	3.42	4.10	4.32	4.32	3.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	5	2	1	4	4	3.00	1179/1323	3.45	3.92	4.00	3.91	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	2	0	1	1	2.50	1333/1384	3.19	4.02	4.10	3.92	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	2	3	0	0	1	2.17	1365/1378	3.08	4.22	4.29	4.09	2.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	4	1	0	1	2.67	1340/1378	3.18	4.11	4.31	4.08	2.67
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 904	3.38	3.98	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	1	4	1	1	3	3.10	224/ 232	4.12	4.52	4.19	4.25	3.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	4	1	1	3	3.10	229/ 239	4.02	4.47	4.21	4.35	3.10
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	175/ 230	4.44	4.67	4.44	4.58	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	2	4	1	2	1	2.60	227/ 231	4.07	4.49	4.31	4.45	2.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	189/ 218	3.92	4.35	4.18	4.47	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0104
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 178
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	8	4	4	3.35	1578/1670	3.54	4.26	4.31	4.23	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	6	5	2	3.00	1603/1666	3.55	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	1	8	5	1	2.80	1384/1406	3.42	4.09	4.32	4.31	2.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	8	6	1	3.05	1563/1615	3.60	4.05	4.24	4.17	3.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	8	3	4	3.15	1444/1566	3.76	4.05	4.07	4.03	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	8	4	1	2.75	1494/1528	3.48	3.88	4.12	4.00	2.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	4	3	5	3.10	1568/1650	3.63	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	1119/1667	4.59	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	2	9	1	0	2.64	1587/1626	3.09	3.86	4.11	4.07	2.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	6	5	5	3.58	1451/1559	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	0	4	8	4	3.53	1523/1560	4.08	4.57	4.72	4.68	3.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	4	7	4	2	3.11	1481/1549	3.51	4.10	4.31	4.32	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	9	3	3	3.22	1448/1546	3.42	4.10	4.32	4.32	3.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	4	3	7	1	1	2.50	1269/1323	3.45	3.92	4.00	3.91	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	6	1	1	3.22	1209/1384	3.19	4.02	4.10	3.92	3.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	7	1	0	3.00	1297/1378	3.08	4.22	4.29	4.09	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	1	5	1	0	2.56	1349/1378	3.18	4.11	4.31	4.08	2.56
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	850/ 904	3.38	3.98	4.03	3.94	2.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	3	1	3	6	1	3.07	224/ 232	4.12	4.52	4.19	4.25	3.07
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	2	5	2	3	3.31	224/ 239	4.02	4.47	4.21	4.35	3.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	188/ 230	4.44	4.67	4.44	4.58	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	189/ 231	4.07	4.49	4.31	4.45	3.77
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	7	4	1	3.31	197/ 218	3.92	4.35	4.18	4.47	3.31
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0104
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 178
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	9	4	8	3.63	1502/1670	3.54	4.26	4.31	4.23	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	10	7	3.75	1409/1666	3.55	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	9	5	3.50	1275/1406	3.42	4.09	4.32	4.31	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	5	6	9	3.91	1218/1615	3.60	4.05	4.24	4.17	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	1	1	6	9	3.71	1173/1566	3.76	4.05	4.07	4.03	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	6	1	7	8	3.65	1207/1528	3.48	3.88	4.12	4.00	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	5	8	3.70	1392/1650	3.63	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	946/1667	4.59	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	3	8	3	0	2.75	1579/1626	3.09	3.86	4.11	4.07	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	6	6	8	3.95	1316/1559	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	1480/1560	4.08	4.57	4.72	4.68	3.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	5	6	5	3.43	1422/1549	3.51	4.10	4.31	4.32	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	3	4	5	5	3.19	1453/1546	3.42	4.10	4.32	4.32	3.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	3	2	2	6	6	3.53	1030/1323	3.45	3.92	4.00	3.91	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	987/1384	3.19	4.02	4.10	3.92	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	1064/1378	3.08	4.22	4.29	4.09	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	1177/1378	3.18	4.11	4.31	4.08	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 904	3.38	3.98	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	75/ 232	4.12	4.52	4.19	4.25	4.54
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	124/ 239	4.02	4.47	4.21	4.35	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	100/ 230	4.44	4.67	4.44	4.58	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	67/ 231	4.07	4.49	4.31	4.45	4.77
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	86/ 218	3.92	4.35	4.18	4.47	4.46
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.72	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	2

			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	24
			Other	13	Non-major
				0	21
### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	2	6	3	4	3.05	1618/1670	3.54	4.26	4.31	4.23	3.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	1	4	6	3	3.17	1588/1666	3.55	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	2	3	5	4	3.17	1336/1406	3.42	4.09	4.32	4.31	3.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	5	7	2	3.22	1539/1615	3.60	4.05	4.24	4.17	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	5	4	4	3.17	1440/1566	3.76	4.05	4.07	4.03	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	6	2	3.17	1423/1528	3.48	3.88	4.12	4.00	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	4	5	5	1	2.83	1606/1650	3.63	4.16	4.22	4.28	2.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	897/1667	4.59	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	1	8	3	0	2.63	1588/1626	3.09	3.86	4.11	4.07	2.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	0	6	2	5	3.24	1501/1559	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	3	0	1	4	9	3.94	1482/1560	4.08	4.57	4.72	4.68	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	1	5	5	2	3.00	1489/1549	3.51	4.10	4.31	4.32	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	1	1	7	3	3.12	1467/1546	3.42	4.10	4.32	4.32	3.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	3	3	2	5	3	3.13	1167/1323	3.45	3.92	4.00	3.91	3.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	1	2	0	2	2.63	1325/1384	3.19	4.02	4.10	3.92	2.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1265/1378	3.08	4.22	4.29	4.09	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1159/1378	3.18	4.11	4.31	4.08	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	802/ 904	3.38	3.98	4.03	3.94	3.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	135/ 232	4.12	4.52	4.19	4.25	4.13
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	191/ 239	4.02	4.47	4.21	4.35	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	165/ 230	4.44	4.67	4.44	4.58	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	216/ 231	4.07	4.49	4.31	4.45	3.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	3	0	3	1	3.00	201/ 218	3.92	4.35	4.18	4.47	3.00
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	12	0	2	1	5	1	3	3.17	1607/1670	3.54	4.26	4.31	4.23	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1564/1666	3.55	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	1	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1057/1406	3.42	4.09	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	0	1	2	4	1	3	3.27	1526/1615	3.60	4.05	4.24	4.17	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1230/1566	3.76	4.05	4.07	4.03	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	4	3	1	3.10	1440/1528	3.48	3.88	4.12	4.00	3.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1460/1650	3.63	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1157/1667	4.59	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	0	6	1	0	2.88	1564/1626	3.09	3.86	4.11	4.07	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	1396/1559	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1461/1560	4.08	4.57	4.72	4.68	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	1389/1549	3.51	4.10	4.31	4.32	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	2	3	2	1	2.80	1507/1546	3.42	4.10	4.32	4.32	2.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1040/1323	3.45	3.92	4.00	3.91	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1384	3.19	4.02	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1378	3.08	4.22	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1378	3.18	4.11	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 904	3.38	3.98	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	173/ 232	4.12	4.52	4.19	4.25	3.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	178/ 239	4.02	4.47	4.21	4.35	3.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	181/ 230	4.44	4.67	4.44	4.58	4.14
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	201/ 231	4.07	4.49	4.31	4.45	3.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	193/ 218	3.92	4.35	4.18	4.47	3.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0203
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 182
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1620/1670	3.54	4.26	4.31	4.23	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1564/1666	3.55	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1380/1406	3.42	4.09	4.32	4.31	2.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	3	0	3.17	1550/1615	3.60	4.05	4.24	4.17	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	851/1566	3.76	4.05	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1202/1528	3.48	3.88	4.12	4.00	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1521/1650	3.63	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1524/1667	4.59	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1534/1626	3.09	3.86	4.11	4.07	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1431/1559	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1467/1560	4.08	4.57	4.72	4.68	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	1389/1549	3.51	4.10	4.31	4.32	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1425/1546	3.42	4.10	4.32	4.32	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.45	3.92	4.00	3.91	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1033/1384	3.19	4.02	4.10	3.92	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1339/1378	3.08	4.22	4.29	4.09	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1304/1378	3.18	4.11	4.31	4.08	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	461/ 904	3.38	3.98	4.03	3.94	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	80/ 232	4.12	4.52	4.19	4.25	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	131/ 239	4.02	4.47	4.21	4.35	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	120/ 230	4.44	4.67	4.44	4.58	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	114/ 231	4.07	4.49	4.31	4.45	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	180/ 218	3.92	4.35	4.18	4.47	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0204
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 183
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	665/1670	3.54	4.26	4.31	4.23	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	3.55	4.13	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	3.42	4.09	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	3.60	4.05	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	3.76	4.05	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	3.48	3.88	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	3.63	4.16	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.59	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	3.09	3.86	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	896/1559	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1248/1560	4.08	4.57	4.72	4.68	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1146/1549	3.51	4.10	4.31	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1139/1546	3.42	4.10	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1323	3.45	3.92	4.00	3.91	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	4.12	4.52	4.19	4.25	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	4.02	4.47	4.21	4.35	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 230	4.44	4.67	4.44	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 231	4.07	4.49	4.31	4.45	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 218	3.92	4.35	4.18	4.47	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	2	0	5	11	4.39	835/1670	3.54	4.26	4.31	4.23	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1167/1666	3.55	4.13	4.27	4.30	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	1057/1406	3.42	4.09	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	10	5	4.11	1018/1615	3.60	4.05	4.24	4.17	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	675/1566	3.76	4.05	4.07	4.03	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	10	4	4.00	899/1528	3.48	3.88	4.12	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	2	4	9	4.06	1107/1650	3.63	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	712/1667	4.59	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	921/1626	3.09	3.86	4.11	4.07	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	933/1559	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	803/1560	4.08	4.57	4.72	4.68	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1095/1549	3.51	4.10	4.31	4.32	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	1048/1546	3.42	4.10	4.32	4.32	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	670/1323	3.45	3.92	4.00	3.91	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1384	3.19	4.02	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1378	3.08	4.22	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1378	3.18	4.11	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 904	3.38	3.98	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	63/ 232	4.12	4.52	4.19	4.25	4.62
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	68/ 239	4.02	4.47	4.21	4.35	4.62
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	114/ 230	4.44	4.67	4.44	4.58	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	108/ 231	4.07	4.49	4.31	4.45	4.54
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	60/ 218	3.92	4.35	4.18	4.47	4.62
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0207
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 185
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	2	4	6	3.41	1563/1670	3.54	4.26	4.31	4.23	3.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	2	4	3.29	1573/1666	3.55	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	3	4	3.29	1318/1406	3.42	4.09	4.32	4.31	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	5	8	1	3.44	1481/1615	3.60	4.05	4.24	4.17	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	9	3	3.81	1098/1566	3.76	4.05	4.07	4.03	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	2	5	4	3.25	1399/1528	3.48	3.88	4.12	4.00	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	1107/1650	3.63	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1062/1667	4.59	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	6	3	1	2.93	1555/1626	3.09	3.86	4.11	4.07	2.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	1	7	5	3.88	1365/1559	3.86	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1457/1560	4.08	4.57	4.72	4.68	4.12
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	4	5	3	3.38	1436/1549	3.51	4.10	4.31	4.32	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	7	3	3.53	1371/1546	3.42	4.10	4.32	4.32	3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	0	4	5	5	3.53	1030/1323	3.45	3.92	4.00	3.91	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	2	0	3	2.89	1300/1384	3.19	4.02	4.10	3.92	2.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	1271/1378	3.08	4.22	4.29	4.09	3.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1255/1378	3.18	4.11	4.31	4.08	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	718/ 904	3.38	3.98	4.03	3.94	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	173/ 232	4.12	4.52	4.19	4.25	3.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	211/ 239	4.02	4.47	4.21	4.35	3.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	136/ 230	4.44	4.67	4.44	4.58	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	179/ 231	4.07	4.49	4.31	4.45	3.86
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	172/ 218	3.92	4.35	4.18	4.47	3.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		10				
				?	0							

Course-Section: BIOL 123 0101
 Title HUMAN GENETICS
 Instructor: AKINMADE, DAMIL
 Enrollment: 74
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 186
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	4	11	12	3	3.11	1614/1670	3.11	4.26	4.31	4.23	3.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	6	9	9	5	3.03	1601/1666	3.03	4.13	4.27	4.30	3.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	9	9	8	4	2.86	1377/1406	2.86	4.09	4.32	4.31	2.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	5	3	5	11	4	3.21	1541/1615	3.21	4.05	4.24	4.17	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	12	12	6	3.49	1297/1566	3.49	4.05	4.07	4.03	3.49
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	5	3	14	7	2	2.94	1467/1528	2.94	3.88	4.12	4.00	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	4	8	11	9	3.47	1472/1650	3.47	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	712/1667	4.89	4.83	4.67	4.61	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	3	5	17	3	0	2.71	1583/1626	2.71	3.86	4.11	4.07	2.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	2	8	21	4.35	1072/1559	4.35	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	0	4	10	17	4.21	1421/1560	4.21	4.57	4.72	4.68	4.21
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	6	10	11	5	3.39	1432/1549	3.39	4.10	4.31	4.32	3.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	3	8	12	6	3.39	1413/1546	3.39	4.10	4.32	4.32	3.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	4	1	8	9	9	3.58	1000/1323	3.58	3.92	4.00	3.91	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	4	4	4	5	3	2.95	1279/1384	2.95	4.02	4.10	3.92	2.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	4	4	1	4	7	3.30	1256/1378	3.30	4.22	4.29	4.09	3.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	4	2	6	2	6	3.20	1287/1378	3.20	4.11	4.31	4.08	3.20
4. Were special techniques successful	17	6	4	3	4	1	1	2.38	875/ 904	2.38	3.98	4.03	3.94	2.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	24
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 13	General	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 7	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 4	Other	6

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 233 0101
 Title NUTRITION AND HEALTH
 Instructor: WELCH, G.
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 187
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	1	1	6	35	4.66	492/1670	4.66	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	2	2	1	11	28	4.39	808/1666	4.39	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	2	2	7	32	4.52	576/1406	4.52	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	32	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	1	3	7	30	4.52	379/1566	4.52	4.05	4.07	4.00	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	34	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	4	10	30	4.59	443/1650	4.59	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	24	20	4.45	1206/1667	4.45	4.83	4.67	4.64	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	2	4	11	19	4.22	774/1626	4.22	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	2	9	29	4.61	772/1559	4.61	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	39	4.95	298/1560	4.95	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	4	6	30	4.59	586/1549	4.59	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	2	5	32	4.61	595/1546	4.61	4.10	4.32	4.30	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	28	4	1	2	1	5	3.15	1158/1323	3.15	3.92	4.00	4.08	3.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/1384	****	4.02	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1378	****	4.22	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/1378	****	4.11	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were special techniques successful	42	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 6	C 2	General 4	Under-grad 48 Non-major 46
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 28	
			? 2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	4	5	64	4.82	281/1670	4.82	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	7	21	45	4.52	595/1666	4.52	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	3	8	25	36	4.31	836/1406	4.31	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	44	0	1	2	7	19	4.52	541/1615	4.52	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	1	12	20	35	4.31	589/1566	4.31	4.05	4.07	4.00	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	58	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	7	15	49	4.51	570/1650	4.51	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	68	5	4.07	1492/1667	4.07	4.83	4.67	4.64	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	2	0	4	14	43	4.52	387/1626	4.52	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	20	49	4.64	722/1559	4.64	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	68	4.90	596/1560	4.90	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	24	45	4.58	586/1549	4.58	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	12	58	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.10	4.32	4.30	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	15	2	1	4	16	30	4.34	481/1323	4.34	3.92	4.00	4.08	4.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	57	0	3	0	2	4	9	3.89	****/1384	****	4.02	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	57	0	1	0	5	4	8	4.00	****/1378	****	4.22	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	56	0	1	2	3	3	10	4.00	977/1378	4.00	4.11	4.31	4.26	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	57	9	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	72	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.52	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	73	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.47	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	73	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.67	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.49	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	4.35	4.18	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	74	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	74	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	74	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	74	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	1	Major	15
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	32							
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	7	C	8	General		3	Under-grad	74	Non-major	60
84-150	22	3.00-3.49	24	D	1							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives		2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		59				
				?	4							

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 189
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	165/1670	4.87	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	280/1666	4.76	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	525/1406	4.70	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	446/1615	4.27	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	165/1566	4.68	4.05	4.07	4.00	4.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1011/1528	3.56	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	246/1650	4.83	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	4.96	4.83	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	151/1626	4.69	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1559	4.76	4.38	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	4.82	4.57	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1549	4.72	4.10	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1546	4.70	4.10	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	522/1323	4.13	3.92	4.00	4.08	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.02	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	695/1378	4.43	4.22	4.29	4.25	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.11	4.31	4.26	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	32/ 232	4.84	4.52	4.19	4.35	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	25/ 239	4.83	4.47	4.21	4.33	4.90
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	87/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.61	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	59/ 231	4.82	4.49	4.31	4.52	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	62/ 218	4.55	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General		0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		11				
				?	0							

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	325/1670	4.87	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	390/1666	4.76	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	283/1406	4.70	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	981/1615	4.27	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	419/1566	4.68	4.05	4.07	4.00	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	7	2	3.16	1426/1528	3.56	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	201/1650	4.83	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	405/1667	4.96	4.83	4.67	4.64	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	278/1626	4.69	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	796/1559	4.76	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1126/1560	4.82	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	749/1549	4.72	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	889/1546	4.70	4.10	4.32	4.30	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	692/1323	4.13	3.92	4.00	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1384	4.50	4.02	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	4.43	4.22	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	4.33	4.11	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	32/ 232	4.84	4.52	4.19	4.35	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	52/ 239	4.83	4.47	4.21	4.33	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	92/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.61	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	59/ 231	4.82	4.49	4.31	4.52	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 218	4.55	4.35	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0201
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 190
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0201
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 191
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	325/1670	4.87	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	390/1666	4.76	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	283/1406	4.70	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	981/1615	4.27	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	419/1566	4.68	4.05	4.07	4.00	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	7	2	3.16	1426/1528	3.56	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.16
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	201/1650	4.83	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	405/1667	4.96	4.83	4.67	4.64	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1626	4.69	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1559	4.76	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	855/1560	4.82	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1549	4.72	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	345/1546	4.70	4.10	4.32	4.30	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1323	4.13	3.92	4.00	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1384	4.50	4.02	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	4.43	4.22	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	4.33	4.11	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	32/ 232	4.84	4.52	4.19	4.35	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	52/ 239	4.83	4.47	4.21	4.33	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	92/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.61	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	59/ 231	4.82	4.49	4.31	4.52	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 218	4.55	4.35	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0201
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 191
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0301
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 192
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	165/1670	4.87	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1666	4.76	4.13	4.27	4.27	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	153/1406	4.70	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	775/1615	4.27	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	226/1566	4.68	4.05	4.07	4.00	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	899/1528	3.56	3.88	4.12	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1650	4.83	4.16	4.22	4.20	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.96	4.83	4.67	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1626	4.69	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	4.76	4.38	4.46	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	4.82	4.57	4.72	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1549	4.72	4.10	4.31	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1546	4.70	4.10	4.32	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	183/1323	4.13	3.92	4.00	4.08	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	4.50	4.02	4.10	4.07	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1378	4.43	4.22	4.29	4.25	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1378	4.33	4.11	4.31	4.26	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 232	4.84	4.52	4.19	4.35	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 239	4.83	4.47	4.21	4.33	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.61	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 231	4.82	4.49	4.31	4.52	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 218	4.55	4.35	4.18	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		12				
				?	0							

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0501
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 193
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	185/1670	4.87	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	415/1666	4.76	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	703/1406	4.70	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1028/1615	4.27	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	170/1566	4.68	4.05	4.07	4.00	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1257/1528	3.56	3.88	4.12	4.11	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	361/1650	4.83	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.96	4.83	4.67	4.64	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	637/1626	4.69	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	971/1559	4.76	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1090/1560	4.82	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	762/1549	4.72	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	919/1546	4.70	4.10	4.32	4.30	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1040/1323	4.13	3.92	4.00	4.08	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1384	4.50	4.02	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1378	4.43	4.22	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1378	4.33	4.11	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	32/ 232	4.84	4.52	4.19	4.35	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	38/ 239	4.83	4.47	4.21	4.33	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	63/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.61	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	81/ 231	4.82	4.49	4.31	4.52	4.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	6	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	78/ 218	4.55	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0501
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 193
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	70	0	3	2	10	29	42	4.22	1027/1670	4.22	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	71	0	3	4	21	30	27	3.87	1337/1666	3.87	4.13	4.27	4.27	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	71	0	5	7	17	28	28	3.79	1194/1406	3.79	4.09	4.32	4.39	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	71	54	3	7	5	10	6	3.29	****/1615	****	4.05	4.24	4.29	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	75	11	3	4	14	21	28	3.96	930/1566	3.96	4.05	4.07	4.00	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	75	59	1	1	7	5	8	3.82	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	75	1	3	2	18	26	31	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	75	1	0	0	0	1	79	4.99	135/1667	4.99	4.83	4.67	4.64	4.99
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	80	0	4	1	20	35	16	3.76	1247/1626	3.59	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	72	0	3	2	6	22	51	4.38	1042/1559	4.39	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	71	0	2	3	3	17	60	4.53	1231/1560	4.57	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	71	0	3	5	21	35	21	3.78	1299/1549	3.63	4.10	4.31	4.25	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	71	0	4	4	9	25	43	4.16	1056/1546	4.09	4.10	4.32	4.30	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	71	7	5	7	8	27	31	3.92	794/1323	3.99	3.92	4.00	4.08	3.99
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	140	0	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	****/1384	****	4.02	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	140	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	****/1378	****	4.22	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	140	0	0	3	1	6	6	3.94	****/1378	****	4.11	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were special techniques successful	140	7	2	0	2	0	5	3.67	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	152	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 232	****	4.52	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	153	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.47	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	153	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.67	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	153	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.49	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	153	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 218	****	4.35	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	155	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	155	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	155	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	155	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	155	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	155	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	155	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	155	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 1 Major 16
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 1	B 23	General 10	Under-grad 155 Non-major 140
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 30		
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 15	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 18	F 0	Electives 8	#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	56	
?	5			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	70	0	3	2	10	29	42	4.22	1027/1670	4.22	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	71	0	3	4	21	30	27	3.87	1337/1666	3.87	4.13	4.27	4.27	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	71	0	5	7	17	28	28	3.79	1194/1406	3.79	4.09	4.32	4.39	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	71	54	3	7	5	10	6	3.29	****/1615	****	4.05	4.24	4.29	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	75	11	3	4	14	21	28	3.96	930/1566	3.96	4.05	4.07	4.00	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	75	59	1	1	7	5	8	3.82	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	75	1	3	2	18	26	31	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	75	1	0	0	0	1	79	4.99	135/1667	4.99	4.83	4.67	4.64	4.99
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	95	0	2	6	23	25	5	3.41	1438/1626	3.59	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	89	0	0	2	9	16	40	4.40	1022/1559	4.39	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	89	0	1	0	4	14	48	4.61	1150/1560	4.57	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	89	0	6	4	20	25	12	3.49	1393/1549	3.63	4.10	4.31	4.25	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	89	0	4	4	7	24	28	4.01	1135/1546	4.09	4.10	4.32	4.30	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	89	5	3	3	8	22	26	4.05	677/1323	3.99	3.92	4.00	4.08	3.99
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	140	0	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	****/1384	****	4.02	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	140	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	****/1378	****	4.22	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	140	0	0	3	1	6	6	3.94	****/1378	****	4.11	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were special techniques successful	140	7	2	0	2	0	5	3.67	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	152	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 232	****	4.52	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	153	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	4.47	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	153	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.67	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	153	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.49	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	153	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 218	****	4.35	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	155	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	155	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	155	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	155	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	155	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	155	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	155	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	155	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 1 Major 16
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 1	B 23	General 10	Under-grad 155 Non-major 140
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 4	C 30		
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 15	D 0	Electives 8	#### - Means there are not enough
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 18	F 0		

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	56	
?	5			

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 196
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	253/1670	4.61	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	490/1666	4.54	4.13	4.27	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	763/1406	4.45	4.09	4.32	4.37	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	944/1615	4.32	4.05	4.24	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	1	0	3	8	4.00	851/1566	4.05	4.05	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	1	3	12	4.28	688/1528	4.28	3.88	4.12	4.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	5	9	4.00	1135/1650	4.18	4.16	4.22	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	675/1667	4.89	4.83	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	239/1626	4.06	3.86	4.11	4.18	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	355/1559	4.34	4.38	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	596/1560	4.47	4.57	4.72	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	683/1549	4.07	4.10	4.31	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	655/1546	4.08	4.10	4.32	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	283/1323	3.94	3.92	4.00	4.13	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	434/1384	4.44	4.02	4.10	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	348/1378	4.40	4.22	4.29	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	653/1378	4.06	4.11	4.31	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.20	3.98	4.03	4.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	41/ 232	4.71	4.52	4.19	4.76	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	65/ 239	4.67	4.47	4.21	4.65	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	105/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.59	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	55/ 231	4.64	4.49	4.31	4.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	111/ 218	4.44	4.35	4.18	4.29	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.25	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 196
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 197
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	253/1670	4.61	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	490/1666	4.54	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	763/1406	4.45	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.37
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	944/1615	4.32	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	1	0	3	8	4.00	851/1566	4.05	4.05	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	1	3	12	4.28	688/1528	4.28	3.88	4.12	4.11	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	5	9	4.00	1135/1650	4.18	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	675/1667	4.89	4.83	4.67	4.64	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	1329/1626	4.06	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	1143/1559	4.34	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1493/1560	4.47	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1322/1549	4.07	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	3	0	6	2	3.64	1341/1546	4.08	4.10	4.32	4.30	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	960/1323	3.94	3.92	4.00	4.08	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	434/1384	4.44	4.02	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	348/1378	4.40	4.22	4.29	4.25	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	653/1378	4.06	4.11	4.31	4.26	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.20	3.98	4.03	4.01	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	41/ 232	4.71	4.52	4.19	4.35	4.76
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	65/ 239	4.67	4.47	4.21	4.33	4.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	105/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.61	4.59
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	55/ 231	4.64	4.49	4.31	4.52	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	111/ 218	4.44	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 197
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0201
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 198
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	611/1670	4.61	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	556/1666	4.54	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	597/1406	4.45	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	825/1615	4.32	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	752/1566	4.05	4.05	4.07	4.00	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	651/1528	4.28	3.88	4.12	4.11	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	1067/1650	4.18	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1667	4.89	4.83	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	126/1626	4.06	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	755/1559	4.34	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	647/1560	4.47	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	762/1549	4.07	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	715/1546	4.08	4.10	4.32	4.30	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	1	6	6	3.81	886/1323	3.94	3.92	4.00	4.08	3.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	221/1384	4.44	4.02	4.10	4.07	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	894/1378	4.40	4.22	4.29	4.25	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1086/1378	4.06	4.11	4.31	4.26	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 904	4.20	3.98	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	22/ 232	4.71	4.52	4.19	4.35	4.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	76/ 239	4.67	4.47	4.21	4.33	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	31/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.61	4.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	83/ 231	4.64	4.49	4.31	4.52	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	58/ 218	4.44	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0201
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 199
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	611/1670	4.61	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	556/1666	4.54	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	597/1406	4.45	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	10	6	4.29	825/1615	4.32	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	752/1566	4.05	4.05	4.07	4.00	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	651/1528	4.28	3.88	4.12	4.11	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	1067/1650	4.18	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1667	4.89	4.83	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	953/1626	4.06	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	1360/1559	4.34	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1457/1560	4.47	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1345/1549	4.07	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1285/1546	4.08	4.10	4.32	4.30	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.94	3.92	4.00	4.08	3.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	221/1384	4.44	4.02	4.10	4.07	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	894/1378	4.40	4.22	4.29	4.25	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1086/1378	4.06	4.11	4.31	4.26	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 904	4.20	3.98	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	22/ 232	4.71	4.52	4.19	4.35	4.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	76/ 239	4.67	4.47	4.21	4.33	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	31/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.61	4.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	83/ 231	4.64	4.49	4.31	4.52	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	58/ 218	4.44	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	3	Under-grad 18 Non-major 14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	11	
			? 0			

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0301
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 200
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	414/1670	4.61	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	529/1666	4.54	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	525/1406	4.45	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	401/1615	4.32	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	389/1566	4.05	4.05	4.07	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	421/1528	4.28	3.88	4.12	4.11	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	471/1650	4.18	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	4.89	4.83	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	831/1626	4.06	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	469/1559	4.34	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	725/1560	4.47	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	876/1549	4.07	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	631/1546	4.08	4.10	4.32	4.30	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	507/1323	3.94	3.92	4.00	4.08	3.99
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	434/1384	4.44	4.02	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	510/1378	4.40	4.22	4.29	4.25	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	777/1378	4.06	4.11	4.31	4.26	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	289/ 904	4.20	3.98	4.03	4.01	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	44/ 232	4.71	4.52	4.19	4.35	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	34/ 239	4.67	4.47	4.21	4.33	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	74/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.61	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	53/ 231	4.64	4.49	4.31	4.52	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	65/ 218	4.44	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.58
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0301
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 200
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0301
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 201
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	414/1670	4.61	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	529/1666	4.54	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	525/1406	4.45	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	401/1615	4.32	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	389/1566	4.05	4.05	4.07	4.00	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	421/1528	4.28	3.88	4.12	4.11	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	471/1650	4.18	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	4.89	4.83	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1275/1626	4.06	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1260/1559	4.34	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1180/1560	4.47	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1345/1549	4.07	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.01
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	1293/1546	4.08	4.10	4.32	4.30	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	960/1323	3.94	3.92	4.00	4.08	3.99
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	434/1384	4.44	4.02	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	510/1378	4.40	4.22	4.29	4.25	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	777/1378	4.06	4.11	4.31	4.26	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	289/ 904	4.20	3.98	4.03	4.01	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	44/ 232	4.71	4.52	4.19	4.35	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	34/ 239	4.67	4.47	4.21	4.33	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	74/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.61	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	53/ 231	4.64	4.49	4.31	4.52	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	65/ 218	4.44	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.58
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0301
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 201
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0401
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 202
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	414/1670	4.61	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	355/1666	4.54	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	597/1406	4.45	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	660/1615	4.32	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1200/1566	4.05	4.05	4.07	4.00	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	899/1528	4.28	3.88	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	867/1650	4.18	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1104/1667	4.89	4.83	4.67	4.64	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	403/1626	4.06	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	809/1559	4.34	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	1114/1560	4.47	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	683/1549	4.07	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	869/1546	4.08	4.10	4.32	4.30	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	384/1323	3.94	3.92	4.00	4.08	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	434/1384	4.44	4.02	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	400/1378	4.40	4.22	4.29	4.25	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	867/1378	4.06	4.11	4.31	4.26	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 904	4.20	3.98	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	51/ 232	4.71	4.52	4.19	4.35	4.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	54/ 239	4.67	4.47	4.21	4.33	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	81/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.61	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	130/ 231	4.64	4.49	4.31	4.52	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	71/ 218	4.44	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.55
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0401
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 202
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0401
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 203
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	414/1670	4.61	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	355/1666	4.54	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	597/1406	4.45	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	660/1615	4.32	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1200/1566	4.05	4.05	4.07	4.00	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	899/1528	4.28	3.88	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	867/1650	4.18	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1104/1667	4.89	4.83	4.67	4.64	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	6	6	0	3.50	1384/1626	4.06	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1092/1559	4.34	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1326/1560	4.47	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1027/1549	4.07	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1139/1546	4.08	4.10	4.32	4.30	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1323	3.94	3.92	4.00	4.08	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	434/1384	4.44	4.02	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	400/1378	4.40	4.22	4.29	4.25	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	867/1378	4.06	4.11	4.31	4.26	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 904	4.20	3.98	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	51/ 232	4.71	4.52	4.19	4.35	4.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	54/ 239	4.67	4.47	4.21	4.33	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	81/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.61	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	130/ 231	4.64	4.49	4.31	4.52	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	71/ 218	4.44	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.55
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0401
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 203
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0501
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 204
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	1017/1670	4.61	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	991/1666	4.54	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	844/1406	4.45	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	1055/1615	4.32	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	962/1566	4.05	4.05	4.07	4.00	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	679/1528	4.28	3.88	4.12	4.11	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	1235/1650	4.18	4.16	4.22	4.20	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1667	4.89	4.83	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	953/1626	4.06	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	1150/1559	4.34	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1138/1560	4.47	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1146/1549	4.07	4.10	4.31	4.25	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	1087/1546	4.08	4.10	4.32	4.30	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	0	6	7	4.07	670/1323	3.94	3.92	4.00	4.08	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	944/1384	4.44	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1150/1378	4.40	4.22	4.29	4.25	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1240/1378	4.06	4.11	4.31	4.26	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 904	4.20	3.98	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	89/ 232	4.71	4.52	4.19	4.35	4.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	73/ 239	4.67	4.47	4.21	4.33	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	57/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.61	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	114/ 231	4.64	4.49	4.31	4.52	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	127/ 218	4.44	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0501
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 204
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0501
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 205
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	3	10	4.24	1017/1670	4.61	4.26	4.31	4.32	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	991/1666	4.54	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	844/1406	4.45	4.09	4.32	4.39	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	1055/1615	4.32	4.05	4.24	4.29	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	962/1566	4.05	4.05	4.07	4.00	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	679/1528	4.28	3.88	4.12	4.11	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	1235/1650	4.18	4.16	4.22	4.20	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1667	4.89	4.83	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1384/1626	4.06	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1418/1559	4.34	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1504/1560	4.47	4.57	4.72	4.73	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1358/1549	4.07	4.10	4.31	4.25	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1379/1546	4.08	4.10	4.32	4.30	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1323	3.94	3.92	4.00	4.08	4.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	944/1384	4.44	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1150/1378	4.40	4.22	4.29	4.25	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1240/1378	4.06	4.11	4.31	4.26	3.38
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 904	4.20	3.98	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	89/ 232	4.71	4.52	4.19	4.35	4.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	73/ 239	4.67	4.47	4.21	4.33	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	57/ 230	4.77	4.67	4.44	4.61	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	114/ 231	4.64	4.49	4.31	4.52	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	127/ 218	4.44	4.35	4.18	4.25	4.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0501
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 205
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: MENDELSON, TAMR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 251
 Questionnaires: 129

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 206
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	2	4	18	41	58	4.21	1038/1670	4.21	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	5	32	45	40	3.98	1222/1666	3.98	4.13	4.27	4.18	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	1	1	4	24	39	52	4.14	964/1406	4.14	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	47	3	5	20	23	23	3.78	1306/1615	3.78	4.05	4.24	4.18	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	14	9	14	30	24	27	3.44	1322/1566	3.44	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	51	13	2	20	14	17	3.30	1386/1528	3.30	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	1	1	7	15	27	68	4.31	844/1650	4.31	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	1	0	0	0	52	66	4.56	1119/1667	4.56	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	2	2	24	50	26	3.92	1089/1626	3.91	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	1	6	21	84	4.68	656/1559	4.59	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	2	3	6	16	85	4.60	1171/1560	4.73	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	2	6	12	23	70	4.35	876/1549	4.31	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	4	2	12	19	73	4.41	849/1546	4.42	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	3	3	3	14	18	69	4.37	448/1323	4.30	3.92	4.00	3.99	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	88	0	3	4	8	10	16	3.78	983/1384	3.78	4.02	4.10	4.12	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	89	0	2	2	2	11	23	4.28	848/1378	4.28	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	89	0	0	2	5	9	24	4.38	777/1378	4.38	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	90	9	3	3	6	16	2	3.37	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 48	Required for Majors	5	Graduate 0	Major	71
28-55	14	1.00-1.99 0	B 43					
56-83	15	2.00-2.99 7	C 12	General	7	Under-grad 129	Non-major	58
84-150	21	3.00-3.49 24	D 1					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 26	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
			P 0					
			I 0	Other	92			
			? 5					

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: OMLAND, KEVIN E (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 251
 Questionnaires: 129

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 207
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	2	4	18	41	58	4.21	1038/1670	4.21	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	5	32	45	40	3.98	1222/1666	3.98	4.13	4.27	4.18	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	1	1	4	24	39	52	4.14	964/1406	4.14	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	47	3	5	20	23	23	3.78	1306/1615	3.78	4.05	4.24	4.18	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	14	9	14	30	24	27	3.44	1322/1566	3.44	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	51	13	2	20	14	17	3.30	1386/1528	3.30	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	1	1	7	15	27	68	4.31	844/1650	4.31	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	1	0	0	0	52	66	4.56	1119/1667	4.56	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	38	1	3	1	19	47	20	3.89	1143/1626	3.91	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	0	3	13	22	59	4.41	1009/1559	4.59	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	0	0	2	11	84	4.85	751/1560	4.73	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	2	3	11	30	51	4.29	952/1549	4.31	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	33	1	2	2	8	21	62	4.46	768/1546	4.42	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	8	4	3	18	14	47	4.13	641/1323	4.30	3.92	4.00	3.99	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	88	0	3	4	8	10	16	3.78	983/1384	3.78	4.02	4.10	4.12	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	89	0	2	2	2	11	23	4.28	848/1378	4.28	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	89	0	0	2	5	9	24	4.38	777/1378	4.38	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	90	9	3	3	6	16	2	3.37	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 48	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 71
28-55	14	1.00-1.99 0	B 43		
56-83	15	2.00-2.99 7	C 12	General 7	Under-grad 129 Non-major 58
84-150	21	3.00-3.49 24	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 26	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 92	
			? 5		

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 251
 Questionnaires: 129

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 208
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	2	4	18	41	58	4.21	1038/1670	4.21	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	5	32	45	40	3.98	1222/1666	3.98	4.13	4.27	4.18	3.98
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	1	1	4	24	39	52	4.14	964/1406	4.14	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	47	3	5	20	23	23	3.78	1306/1615	3.78	4.05	4.24	4.18	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	14	9	14	30	24	27	3.44	1322/1566	3.44	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	51	13	2	20	14	17	3.30	1386/1528	3.30	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	1	1	7	15	27	68	4.31	844/1650	4.31	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	1	0	0	0	52	66	4.56	1119/1667	4.56	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	0	0	1	24	54	19	3.93	1089/1626	3.91	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	1	3	24	77	4.69	640/1559	4.59	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	0	4	17	83	4.76	948/1560	4.73	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	3	14	37	52	4.30	936/1549	4.31	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	2	12	25	62	4.39	869/1546	4.42	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	1	3	1	12	21	64	4.41	423/1323	4.30	3.92	4.00	3.99	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	88	0	3	4	8	10	16	3.78	983/1384	3.78	4.02	4.10	4.12	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	89	0	2	2	2	11	23	4.28	848/1378	4.28	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	89	0	0	2	5	9	24	4.38	777/1378	4.38	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	90	9	3	3	6	16	2	3.37	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 48	Required for Majors	5	Graduate 0	Major 71
28-55	14	1.00-1.99 0	B 43				
56-83	15	2.00-2.99 7	C 12	General	7	Under-grad 129	Non-major 58
84-150	21	3.00-3.49 24	D 1				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 26	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0				
			I 0	Other	92		
			? 5				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	2	12	24	39	38	3.86	1372/1670	3.86	4.26	4.31	4.24	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	4	16	45	37	13	3.34	1564/1666	3.34	4.13	4.27	4.18	3.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	10	33	45	14	11	2.85	1379/1406	2.85	4.09	4.32	4.22	2.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	42	9	15	29	15	3	2.83	1593/1615	2.83	4.05	4.24	4.18	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	3	9	11	33	32	20	3.41	1348/1566	3.41	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	81	5	6	12	5	0	2.61	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	7	8	23	34	36	3.78	1347/1650	3.78	4.16	4.22	4.12	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	0	2	106	4.98	135/1667	4.98	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	0	0	12	59	28	4.16	831/1626	3.35	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	2	0	5	26	80	4.61	755/1559	3.96	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	1	4	26	81	4.67	1090/1560	4.40	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	2	6	40	64	4.45	749/1549	3.56	4.10	4.31	4.25	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	2	3	9	34	64	4.38	869/1546	3.60	4.10	4.32	4.24	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	8	4	5	11	32	53	4.19	590/1323	3.70	3.92	4.00	3.99	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	78	0	15	12	7	8	4	2.43	1344/1384	2.43	4.02	4.10	4.12	2.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	78	0	10	5	15	8	8	2.98	1305/1378	2.98	4.22	4.29	4.30	2.98
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	79	0	10	1	16	9	9	3.13	1296/1378	3.13	4.11	4.31	4.33	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	80	24	6	4	7	3	0	2.35	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	117	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 232	****	4.52	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	118	0	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 239	****	4.47	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	119	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	4.67	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	119	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 231	****	4.49	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	119	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	4.35	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	118	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	119	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	119	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	119	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	119	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	121	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	122	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	123	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	123	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	123	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	122	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	122	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	122	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	122	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	122	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 302 0101
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI
 Instructor: EISENMANN, DAVI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 269
 Questionnaires: 124

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 209
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	38	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	52
28-55	28	1.00-1.99	0	B	44						
56-83	21	2.00-2.99	10	C	17	General	1	Under-grad	124	Non-major	72
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	20	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	26	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	98				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 302 0101
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI
 Instructor: LINDAHL, LASSE (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 269
 Questionnaires: 124

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 210
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	2	12	24	39	38	3.86	1372/1670	3.86	4.26	4.31	4.24	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	4	16	45	37	13	3.34	1564/1666	3.34	4.13	4.27	4.18	3.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	10	33	45	14	11	2.85	1379/1406	2.85	4.09	4.32	4.22	2.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	42	9	15	29	15	3	2.83	1593/1615	2.83	4.05	4.24	4.18	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	16	3	9	11	33	32	20	3.41	1348/1566	3.41	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	81	5	6	12	5	0	2.61	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	7	8	23	34	36	3.78	1347/1650	3.78	4.16	4.22	4.12	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	0	0	0	0	2	106	4.98	135/1667	4.98	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	1	18	26	39	16	0	2.54	1592/1626	3.35	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	11	17	27	36	19	3.32	1491/1559	3.96	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	1	8	16	35	49	4.13	1453/1560	4.40	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	22	28	31	23	6	2.66	1518/1549	3.56	4.10	4.31	4.25	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	2	26	23	20	23	16	2.81	1505/1546	3.60	4.10	4.32	4.24	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	7	18	18	15	27	24	3.21	1143/1323	3.70	3.92	4.00	3.99	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	78	0	15	12	7	8	4	2.43	1344/1384	2.43	4.02	4.10	4.12	2.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	78	0	10	5	15	8	8	2.98	1305/1378	2.98	4.22	4.29	4.30	2.98
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	79	0	10	1	16	9	9	3.13	1296/1378	3.13	4.11	4.31	4.33	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	80	24	6	4	7	3	0	2.35	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	117	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 232	****	4.52	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	118	0	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 239	****	4.47	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	119	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	4.67	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	119	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 231	****	4.49	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	119	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	4.35	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	118	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	119	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	119	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	119	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	119	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	121	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	122	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	123	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	123	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	123	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	122	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	122	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	122	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	122	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	122	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 302 0101
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI
 Instructor: LINDAHL, LASSE (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 269
 Questionnaires: 124

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 210
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	38	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	52
28-55	28	1.00-1.99	0	B	44						
56-83	21	2.00-2.99	10	C	17	General	1	Under-grad	124	Non-major	72
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	20	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	26	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	98				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 211
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	1038/1670	4.14	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	1081/1666	4.20	4.13	4.27	4.18	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	908/1406	4.27	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	592/1615	4.28	4.05	4.24	4.18	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1039/1566	3.84	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	3	7	7	3.89	1047/1528	3.96	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	950/1650	4.22	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	11	3	4.00	953/1626	4.00	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	371/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	751/1560	4.61	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	6	12	4.53	658/1549	4.34	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	822/1546	4.34	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	465/1323	4.12	3.92	4.00	3.99	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	519/1384	4.32	4.02	4.10	4.12	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	603/1378	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	813/1378	4.15	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 904	3.94	3.98	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	72/ 232	4.47	4.52	4.19	4.04	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	0	6	11	4.44	100/ 239	4.41	4.47	4.21	3.99	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	57/ 230	4.70	4.67	4.44	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	93/ 231	4.50	4.49	4.31	4.11	4.61
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	78/ 218	4.52	4.35	4.18	3.93	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.50	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 211
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	13
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 212
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	1038/1670	4.14	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	1081/1666	4.20	4.13	4.27	4.18	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	908/1406	4.27	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	592/1615	4.28	4.05	4.24	4.18	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1039/1566	3.84	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	3	7	7	3.89	1047/1528	3.96	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	950/1650	4.22	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	888/1626	4.00	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	435/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1090/1560	4.61	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	337/1549	4.34	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	382/1546	4.34	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	1	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	545/1323	4.12	3.92	4.00	3.99	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	519/1384	4.32	4.02	4.10	4.12	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	603/1378	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	813/1378	4.15	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	17	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 904	3.94	3.98	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	72/ 232	4.47	4.52	4.19	4.04	4.56
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	0	6	11	4.44	100/ 239	4.41	4.47	4.21	3.99	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	57/ 230	4.70	4.67	4.44	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	93/ 231	4.50	4.49	4.31	4.11	4.61
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	78/ 218	4.52	4.35	4.18	3.93	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.50	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 212
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	13
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0202
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 213
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	974/1670	4.14	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	943/1666	4.20	4.13	4.27	4.18	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	799/1406	4.27	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	1055/1615	4.28	4.05	4.24	4.18	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	1	4	7	3.75	1144/1566	3.84	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	832/1528	3.96	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	6	7	3.94	1220/1650	4.22	4.16	4.22	4.12	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	953/1626	4.00	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	796/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	803/1560	4.61	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	876/1549	4.34	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	899/1546	4.34	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	560/1323	4.12	3.92	4.00	3.99	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	798/1384	4.32	4.02	4.10	4.12	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	898/1378	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	950/1378	4.15	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 904	3.94	3.98	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	83/ 232	4.47	4.52	4.19	4.04	4.47
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	134/ 239	4.41	4.47	4.21	3.99	4.24
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	116/ 230	4.70	4.67	4.44	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	117/ 231	4.50	4.49	4.31	4.11	4.47
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	116/ 218	4.52	4.35	4.18	3.93	4.24

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0301
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 214
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	1	7	10	4.25	996/1670	4.14	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	846/1666	4.20	4.13	4.27	4.18	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	3	13	4.35	775/1406	4.27	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	750/1615	4.28	4.05	4.24	4.18	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	686/1566	3.84	4.05	4.07	4.04	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	6	9	4.05	870/1528	3.96	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	570/1650	4.22	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	12	5	4.22	762/1626	4.00	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	834/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	892/1560	4.61	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	658/1549	4.34	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	755/1546	4.34	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	3	3	3	6	3.80	894/1323	4.12	3.92	4.00	3.99	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	434/1384	4.32	4.02	4.10	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1378	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1378	4.15	4.11	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 904	3.94	3.98	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	67/ 232	4.47	4.52	4.19	4.04	4.59
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	65/ 239	4.41	4.47	4.21	3.99	4.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	3	0	14	4.65	95/ 230	4.70	4.67	4.44	4.25	4.65
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	98/ 231	4.50	4.49	4.31	4.11	4.59
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	65/ 218	4.52	4.35	4.18	3.93	4.59

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 12			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	18	
			? 1			

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0302
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 215
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1150/1670	4.14	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	8	4.12	1125/1666	4.20	4.13	4.27	4.18	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	876/1406	4.27	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	953/1615	4.28	4.05	4.24	4.18	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	6	7	2	3.73	1159/1566	3.84	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1063/1528	3.96	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	1055/1650	4.22	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	11	3	4.06	921/1626	4.00	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	503/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	929/1560	4.61	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	6	4	7	4.06	1125/1549	4.34	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	1002/1546	4.34	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	545/1323	4.12	3.92	4.00	3.99	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	541/1384	4.32	4.02	4.10	4.12	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	718/1378	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1378	4.15	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 904	3.94	3.98	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	110/ 232	4.47	4.52	4.19	4.04	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	105/ 239	4.41	4.47	4.21	3.99	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	83/ 230	4.70	4.67	4.44	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	132/ 231	4.50	4.49	4.31	4.11	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	94/ 218	4.52	4.35	4.18	3.93	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0302
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 215
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0401
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 216
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	708/1670	4.14	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	11	8	4.29	931/1666	4.20	4.13	4.27	4.18	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	852/1406	4.27	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	499/1615	4.28	4.05	4.24	4.18	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	1	0	2	8	6	4.06	820/1566	3.84	4.05	4.07	4.04	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	706/1528	3.96	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	1	3	4	11	4.00	1135/1650	4.22	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	13	3	4.06	926/1626	4.00	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	435/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	596/1560	4.61	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	722/1549	4.34	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	8	12	4.43	822/1546	4.34	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	537/1323	4.12	3.92	4.00	3.99	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1384	4.32	4.02	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1378	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1378	4.15	4.11	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	3.94	3.98	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	56/ 232	4.47	4.52	4.19	4.04	4.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	108/ 239	4.41	4.47	4.21	3.99	4.41
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	47/ 230	4.70	4.67	4.44	4.25	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	98/ 231	4.50	4.49	4.31	4.11	4.59
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	55/ 218	4.52	4.35	4.18	3.93	4.65
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 24	Non-major 12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 19		
				? 1			

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0401
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 217
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	708/1670	4.14	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	11	8	4.29	931/1666	4.20	4.13	4.27	4.18	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	852/1406	4.27	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	499/1615	4.28	4.05	4.24	4.18	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	1	0	2	8	6	4.06	820/1566	3.84	4.05	4.07	4.04	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	706/1528	3.96	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	1	3	4	11	4.00	1135/1650	4.22	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1124/1626	4.00	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	772/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1398/1560	4.61	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	936/1549	4.34	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1103/1546	4.34	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	857/1323	4.12	3.92	4.00	3.99	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1384	4.32	4.02	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1378	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1378	4.15	4.11	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 904	3.94	3.98	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	56/ 232	4.47	4.52	4.19	4.04	4.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	108/ 239	4.41	4.47	4.21	3.99	4.41
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	47/ 230	4.70	4.67	4.44	4.25	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	98/ 231	4.50	4.49	4.31	4.11	4.59
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	55/ 218	4.52	4.35	4.18	3.93	4.65
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 24	Non-major 12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 19		
				? 1			

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0402
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 218
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	1	2	6	6	3.76	1436/1670	4.14	4.26	4.31	4.24	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	1059/1666	4.20	4.13	4.27	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	1057/1406	4.27	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	1	2	9	4.07	1050/1615	4.28	4.05	4.24	4.18	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	3	4	4	3.50	1285/1566	3.84	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	2	3	6	3.38	1345/1528	3.96	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	675/1650	4.22	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	3	3	7	3.87	1162/1626	4.00	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	640/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	1248/1560	4.61	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	924/1549	4.34	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	1	5	7	4.00	1139/1546	4.34	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	393/1323	4.12	3.92	4.00	3.99	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	570/1384	4.32	4.02	4.10	4.12	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	400/1378	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	867/1378	4.15	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	243/ 904	3.94	3.98	4.03	4.03	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	140/ 232	4.47	4.52	4.19	4.04	4.07
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	1	0	5	7	4.14	142/ 239	4.41	4.47	4.21	3.99	4.14
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	95/ 230	4.70	4.67	4.44	4.25	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	140/ 231	4.50	4.49	4.31	4.11	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	94/ 218	4.52	4.35	4.18	3.93	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0402
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 218
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0501
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 219
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	3	5	7	3.72	1458/1670	4.14	4.26	4.31	4.24	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	4	8	3.89	1331/1666	4.20	4.13	4.27	4.18	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	948/1406	4.27	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	4	8	3.83	1276/1615	4.28	4.05	4.24	4.18	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	4	5	3.35	1366/1566	3.84	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	3	7	3.71	1182/1528	3.96	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	1067/1650	4.22	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1323/1626	4.00	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	1042/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	1376/1560	4.61	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	1095/1549	4.34	4.10	4.31	4.25	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	12	4.33	919/1546	4.34	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	648/1323	4.12	3.92	4.00	3.99	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	740/1384	4.32	4.02	4.10	4.12	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	906/1378	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1076/1378	4.15	4.11	4.31	4.33	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	671/ 904	3.94	3.98	4.03	4.03	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	126/ 232	4.47	4.52	4.19	4.04	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	116/ 239	4.41	4.47	4.21	3.99	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	147/ 230	4.70	4.67	4.44	4.25	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	141/ 231	4.50	4.49	4.31	4.11	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	88/ 218	4.52	4.35	4.18	3.93	4.45
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0501
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 219
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0501
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 220
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	3	5	7	3.72	1458/1670	4.14	4.26	4.31	4.24	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	4	8	3.89	1331/1666	4.20	4.13	4.27	4.18	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	948/1406	4.27	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	4	8	3.83	1276/1615	4.28	4.05	4.24	4.18	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	4	5	3.35	1366/1566	3.84	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	3	7	3.71	1182/1528	3.96	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	1067/1650	4.22	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1282/1626	4.00	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1365/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1495/1560	4.61	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1251/1549	4.34	4.10	4.31	4.25	3.99
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1293/1546	4.34	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	1155/1323	4.12	3.92	4.00	3.99	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	740/1384	4.32	4.02	4.10	4.12	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	906/1378	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1076/1378	4.15	4.11	4.31	4.33	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	671/ 904	3.94	3.98	4.03	4.03	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	126/ 232	4.47	4.52	4.19	4.04	4.18
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	116/ 239	4.41	4.47	4.21	3.99	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	147/ 230	4.70	4.67	4.44	4.25	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	141/ 231	4.50	4.49	4.31	4.11	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	88/ 218	4.52	4.35	4.18	3.93	4.45
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0501
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 220
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0502
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 221
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	876/1670	4.14	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	440/1666	4.20	4.13	4.27	4.18	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	363/1406	4.27	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	326/1615	4.28	4.05	4.24	4.18	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	470/1566	3.84	4.05	4.07	4.04	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	421/1528	3.96	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	307/1650	4.22	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	584/1626	4.00	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	221/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	477/1560	4.61	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	789/1549	4.34	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	288/1546	4.34	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	254/1323	4.12	3.92	4.00	3.99	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1384	4.32	4.02	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1378	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1378	4.15	4.11	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	3.94	3.98	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	30/ 232	4.47	4.52	4.19	4.04	4.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	66/ 239	4.41	4.47	4.21	3.99	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 230	4.70	4.67	4.44	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	40/ 231	4.50	4.49	4.31	4.11	4.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	31/ 218	4.52	4.35	4.18	3.93	4.82

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, DAPHN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 212
 Questionnaires: 92

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 222
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	13	0	2	5	18	20	34	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	2	10	26	22	19	3.58	1484/1666	3.58	4.13	4.27	4.18	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	0	5	16	16	18	24	3.51	1275/1406	3.51	4.09	4.32	4.22	3.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	53	2	3	5	9	6	3.56	1430/1615	3.56	4.05	4.24	4.18	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	15	7	7	8	18	16	21	3.51	1279/1566	3.51	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	63	2	2	5	1	5	3.33	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	1	5	6	16	24	26	3.78	1347/1650	3.78	4.16	4.22	4.12	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	3	0	0	0	0	73	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	0	1	2	25	36	6	3.63	1335/1626	3.45	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	2	5	27	42	4.43	984/1559	4.29	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	3	3	15	56	4.61	1150/1560	4.37	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	3	4	7	37	25	4.01	1141/1549	3.72	4.10	4.31	4.25	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	5	10	31	28	4.03	1131/1546	3.82	4.10	4.32	4.24	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	2	1	4	7	19	42	4.33	490/1323	3.99	3.92	4.00	3.99	3.99
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	84	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	****/1384	****	4.02	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	83	0	3	0	2	2	2	3.00	****/1378	****	4.22	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	83	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	****/1378	****	4.11	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	83	5	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 40
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 34		
56-83	23	2.00-2.99 5	C 9	General 0	Under-grad 92 Non-major 52
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 61	
			? 6		

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY
 Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 212
 Questionnaires: 92

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 223
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	13	0	2	5	18	20	34	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	2	10	26	22	19	3.58	1484/1666	3.58	4.13	4.27	4.18	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	0	5	16	16	18	24	3.51	1275/1406	3.51	4.09	4.32	4.22	3.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	53	2	3	5	9	6	3.56	1430/1615	3.56	4.05	4.24	4.18	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	15	7	7	8	18	16	21	3.51	1279/1566	3.51	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	63	2	2	5	1	5	3.33	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	1	5	6	16	24	26	3.78	1347/1650	3.78	4.16	4.22	4.12	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	16	3	0	0	0	0	73	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	0	4	8	28	23	6	3.28	1483/1626	3.45	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	5	10	25	30	4.14	1230/1559	4.29	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	1	8	6	22	34	4.13	1453/1560	4.37	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	5	8	24	18	15	3.43	1422/1549	3.72	4.10	4.31	4.25	3.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	2	6	7	13	23	19	3.62	1349/1546	3.82	4.10	4.32	4.24	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	9	4	6	15	18	18	3.66	965/1323	3.99	3.92	4.00	3.99	3.99
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	84	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	****/1384	****	4.02	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	83	0	3	0	2	2	2	3.00	****/1378	****	4.22	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	83	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	****/1378	****	4.11	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	83	5	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 40
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 34		
56-83	23	2.00-2.99 5	C 9	General 0	Under-grad 92 Non-major 52
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 61	
			? 6		

Course-Section: BIOL 304L 0101
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY LAB
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 83
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 224
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	10	0	0	2	5	14	44	4.54	632/1670	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	1	2	2	11	48	4.61	490/1666	4.61	4.13	4.27	4.18	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	2	1	7	13	40	4.40	727/1406	4.40	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	0	1	2	5	15	41	4.45	619/1615	4.45	4.05	4.24	4.18	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	6	0	2	5	20	32	4.39	510/1566	4.39	4.05	4.07	4.04	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	1	1	1	7	18	34	4.36	600/1528	4.36	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	1	1	5	12	45	4.55	513/1650	4.55	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	1	3	59	4.92	540/1667	4.92	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	2	18	50	4.65	293/1626	4.55	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	1	6	54	4.87	339/1559	4.87	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	12	48	4.77	911/1560	4.77	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	10	50	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	12	47	4.69	482/1546	4.69	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	19	0	3	6	11	16	4.11	648/1323	4.11	3.92	4.00	3.99	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	****/1384	****	4.02	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	57	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	****/1378	****	4.22	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	57	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	****/1378	****	4.11	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	57	8	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	0	11	33	4.75	44/ 232	4.75	4.52	4.19	4.04	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	4	39	4.86	30/ 239	4.86	4.47	4.21	3.99	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	6	38	4.86	51/ 230	4.86	4.67	4.44	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	1	9	34	4.75	69/ 231	4.75	4.49	4.31	4.11	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	1	1	10	31	4.65	54/ 218	4.65	4.35	4.18	3.93	4.65
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	72	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 304L 0101
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY LAB
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 83
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 224
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	26	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	40
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	32						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	75	Non-major	35
84-150	27	3.00-3.49	19	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	60				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 304L 0101
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY LAB
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 83
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 225
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	10	0	0	2	5	14	44	4.54	632/1670	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	1	2	2	11	48	4.61	490/1666	4.61	4.13	4.27	4.18	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	0	2	1	7	13	40	4.40	727/1406	4.40	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	0	1	2	5	15	41	4.45	619/1615	4.45	4.05	4.24	4.18	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	6	0	2	5	20	32	4.39	510/1566	4.39	4.05	4.07	4.04	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	1	1	1	7	18	34	4.36	600/1528	4.36	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	1	1	5	12	45	4.55	513/1650	4.55	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	1	3	59	4.92	540/1667	4.92	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	54	1	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	499/1626	4.55	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	68	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1559	4.87	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	68	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1560	4.77	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	67	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	****/1549	4.80	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	****/1546	4.69	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	70	2	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1323	4.11	3.92	4.00	3.99	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	****/1384	****	4.02	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	57	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	****/1378	****	4.22	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	57	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	****/1378	****	4.11	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	57	8	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	0	11	33	4.75	44/ 232	4.75	4.52	4.19	4.04	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	1	4	39	4.86	30/ 239	4.86	4.47	4.21	3.99	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	6	38	4.86	51/ 230	4.86	4.67	4.44	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	1	9	34	4.75	69/ 231	4.75	4.49	4.31	4.11	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	1	1	10	31	4.65	54/ 218	4.65	4.35	4.18	3.93	4.65
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	72	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 304L 0101
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY LAB
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 83
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 225
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	26	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	40
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	32						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	75	Non-major	35
84-150	27	3.00-3.49	19	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	60				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 305 0101
 Title COMP. ANIMAL PHYSIOLOG
 Instructor: LIN, WEIHONG (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 209
 Questionnaires: 94

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 226
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	16	0	1	3	13	25	36	4.18	1082/1670	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	17	0	2	8	25	26	16	3.60	1481/1666	3.60	4.13	4.27	4.18	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	18	0	3	11	20	23	19	3.58	1257/1406	3.58	4.09	4.32	4.22	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	17	52	3	2	3	7	10	3.76	1318/1615	3.76	4.05	4.24	4.18	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	3	3	3	18	20	30	3.96	930/1566	3.96	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	18	57	5	2	3	4	5	3.11	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	0	2	6	9	31	29	4.03	1123/1650	4.03	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	18	0	0	0	0	0	76	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	1	3	9	36	22	1	3.13	1525/1626	3.20	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	3	15	21	37	4.21	1185/1559	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	12	19	44	4.43	1310/1560	4.43	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	6	13	24	21	10	3.22	1467/1549	3.45	4.10	4.31	4.25	3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	0	10	11	10	21	22	3.46	1395/1546	3.57	4.10	4.32	4.24	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	8	6	6	12	21	21	3.68	950/1323	3.79	3.92	4.00	3.99	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	76	0	2	1	2	5	8	3.89	****/1384	****	4.02	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	75	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	****/1378	****	4.22	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	76	0	2	0	4	5	7	3.83	****/1378	****	4.11	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	77	6	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 64
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 30		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 3	C 16	General 0	Under-grad 94 Non-major 30
84-150	37	3.00-3.49 21	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 70	
			? 2		

Course-Section: BIOL 305 0101
 Title COMP. ANIMAL PHYSIOLOG
 Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 209
 Questionnaires: 94

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 227
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	16	0	1	3	13	25	36	4.18	1082/1670	4.18	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	17	0	2	8	25	26	16	3.60	1481/1666	3.60	4.13	4.27	4.18	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	18	0	3	11	20	23	19	3.58	1257/1406	3.58	4.09	4.32	4.22	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	17	52	3	2	3	7	10	3.76	1318/1615	3.76	4.05	4.24	4.18	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	17	3	3	3	18	20	30	3.96	930/1566	3.96	4.05	4.07	4.04	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	18	57	5	2	3	4	5	3.11	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	17	0	2	6	9	31	29	4.03	1123/1650	4.03	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	18	0	0	0	0	0	76	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	1	5	8	22	28	4	3.27	1487/1626	3.20	3.86	4.11	4.06	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	2	11	18	37	4.32	1102/1559	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	4	7	12	45	4.44	1294/1560	4.43	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	2	9	18	22	20	3.69	1335/1549	3.45	4.10	4.31	4.25	3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	8	3	17	18	25	3.69	1317/1546	3.57	4.10	4.32	4.24	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	6	4	3	12	22	23	3.89	827/1323	3.79	3.92	4.00	3.99	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	76	0	2	1	2	5	8	3.89	****/1384	****	4.02	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	75	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	****/1378	****	4.22	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	76	0	2	0	4	5	7	3.83	****/1378	****	4.11	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	77	6	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 30		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 3	C 16	General	0
84-150	37	3.00-3.49 21	D 0		Under-grad 94
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	70
			? 2		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 305L 0101
 Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 104
 Questionnaires: 103

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 228
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	24	0	0	2	5	8	64	4.70	440/1670	4.70	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	23	0	0	1	1	12	66	4.79	280/1666	4.79	4.13	4.27	4.18	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	23	0	1	3	14	61	4.66	423/1406	4.66	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.66	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	24	1	1	3	9	22	43	4.32	787/1615	4.32	4.05	4.24	4.18	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	24	9	0	3	6	21	40	4.40	491/1566	4.40	4.05	4.07	4.04	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	23	2	2	5	16	19	36	4.05	870/1528	4.05	3.88	4.12	4.07	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	24	0	1	0	7	16	55	4.57	485/1650	4.57	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	23	0	0	1	0	0	79	4.96	270/1667	4.96	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	44	1	1	0	1	23	33	4.50	403/1626	4.50	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	1	0	4	73	4.91	248/1559	4.91	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	0	1	6	71	4.90	621/1560	4.90	4.57	4.72	4.67	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	0	0	1	9	66	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.10	4.31	4.25	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	2	6	68	4.82	333/1546	4.82	4.10	4.32	4.24	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	2	1	2	7	14	48	4.47	355/1323	4.47	3.92	4.00	3.99	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	76	0	1	1	2	5	18	4.41	541/1384	4.41	4.02	4.10	4.12	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	77	0	1	2	6	3	14	4.04	958/1378	4.04	4.22	4.29	4.30	4.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	77	0	2	1	4	4	15	4.12	942/1378	4.12	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.12
4. Were special techniques successful	77	7	1	0	2	7	9	4.21	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	1	0	10	45	4.77	41/ 232	4.77	4.52	4.19	4.04	4.77
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	0	14	41	4.75	50/ 239	4.75	4.47	4.21	3.99	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	48	0	0	0	1	10	44	4.78	67/ 230	4.78	4.67	4.44	4.25	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	48	2	0	0	1	8	44	4.81	57/ 231	4.81	4.49	4.31	4.11	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	5	0	1	4	12	34	4.55	71/ 218	4.55	4.35	4.18	3.93	4.55
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	102	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 305L 0101
 Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 104
 Questionnaires: 103

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 228
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	51	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	69
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	103	Non-major	34
84-150	42	3.00-3.49	17	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	67				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 396 0101
 Title UGRAD TCHNG ASSISTANTS
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 229
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	557/1670	4.60	4.26	4.31	4.24	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.13	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.09	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.05	4.24	4.18	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.05	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1528	****	3.88	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1650	****	4.16	4.22	4.12	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	637/1626	4.33	3.86	4.11	4.06	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.57	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.10	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.10	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	3.92	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.02	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.22	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.11	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 414 0101
 Title EUKARYOTICS GEN/MOL BI
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, PHIL
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 230
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	4	1	9	13	4.15	1116/1670	4.15	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	7	4	6	10	3.70	1435/1666	3.70	4.13	4.27	4.35	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	1	2	3	6	15	4.19	932/1406	4.19	4.09	4.32	4.48	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	3	3	5	10	6	3.48	1457/1615	3.48	4.05	4.24	4.37	3.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	3	10	11	4.04	832/1566	4.04	4.05	4.07	4.17	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	7	7	9	3.67	1202/1528	3.67	3.88	4.12	4.26	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	1	3	2	6	14	4.12	1067/1650	4.12	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	946/1667	4.73	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	2	0	4	7	9	3.95	1038/1626	3.95	3.86	4.11	4.28	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	2	5	7	13	4.15	1230/1559	4.15	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	7	19	4.63	1138/1560	4.63	4.57	4.72	4.80	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	3	5	11	7	3.74	1313/1549	3.74	4.10	4.31	4.43	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	1	8	15	4.26	987/1546	4.26	4.10	4.32	4.43	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	2	0	2	12	9	4.04	677/1323	4.04	3.92	4.00	4.10	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	7	8	4.12	786/1384	4.12	4.02	4.10	4.32	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	587/1378	4.53	4.22	4.29	4.55	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	550/1378	4.65	4.11	4.31	4.60	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	1	1	1	1	12	4.38	305/ 904	4.38	3.98	4.03	4.22	4.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	3	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 5	General	3	Under-grad	30	Non-major	23
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D 0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	19				
				? 0						

Course-Section: BIOL 420 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS:CELL BIOLOG
 Instructor: MCGRAW, PATRICI
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 231
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1003/1666	4.22	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.09	4.32	4.48	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.05	4.24	4.37	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	675/1566	4.22	4.05	4.07	4.17	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1202/1528	3.67	3.88	4.12	4.26	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1067/1650	4.11	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1335/1626	3.63	3.86	4.11	4.28	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1360/1559	3.89	4.38	4.46	4.58	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1294/1560	4.44	4.57	4.72	4.80	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.10	4.31	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1366/1546	3.56	4.10	4.32	4.43	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	842/1323	3.88	3.92	4.00	4.10	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	4.02	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1378	****	4.22	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1378	****	4.11	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 430 0101
 Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: GLUICK, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 105
 Questionnaires: 80

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 232
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	9	8	12	23	26	3.63	1502/1670	3.63	4.26	4.31	4.45	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	8	16	16	22	16	3.28	1574/1666	3.28	4.13	4.27	4.35	3.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	12	12	18	20	15	3.18	1334/1406	3.18	4.09	4.32	4.48	3.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	7	12	7	14	23	14	3.29	1524/1615	3.29	4.05	4.24	4.37	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	7	8	13	20	23	3.62	1225/1566	3.62	4.05	4.07	4.17	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	15	10	11	25	12	3.12	1434/1528	3.12	3.88	4.12	4.26	3.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	7	14	12	25	19	3.45	1481/1650	3.45	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	2	74	4.97	203/1667	4.97	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	12	7	20	14	7	2.95	1547/1626	2.95	3.86	4.11	4.28	2.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	5	8	23	25	17	3.53	1458/1559	3.53	4.38	4.46	4.58	3.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	5	14	19	39	4.19	1427/1560	4.19	4.57	4.72	4.80	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	18	10	24	12	13	2.90	1508/1549	2.90	4.10	4.31	4.43	2.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	20	8	17	15	16	2.99	1477/1546	2.99	4.10	4.32	4.43	2.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	11	11	14	18	18	3.29	1110/1323	3.29	3.92	4.00	4.10	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	64	0	5	2	5	2	2	2.63	****/1384	****	4.02	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	64	0	3	0	6	3	4	3.31	****/1378	****	4.22	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	64	0	2	0	5	1	8	3.81	****/1378	****	4.11	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	65	6	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.22	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	77	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 232	****	4.52	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	77	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 239	****	4.47	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	77	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 230	****	4.67	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	77	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 231	****	4.49	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	77	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 218	****	4.35	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	77	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	77	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	77	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	77	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	77	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	77	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	77	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	77	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	77	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	77	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	77	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	77	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 430 0101
 Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: GLUICK, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 105
 Questionnaires: 80

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 232
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	51
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	33						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	13	Under-grad	80	Non-major	29
84-150	38	3.00-3.49	17	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	21	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	51				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 434 0101
 Title MICROBIAL MOLEC GENETI
 Instructor: WOLF, RICHARD E
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 233
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	1	3	3	16	4.48	708/1670	4.48	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	1	2	4	15	4.35	858/1666	4.35	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	495/1406	4.61	4.09	4.32	4.48	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	3	1	0	3	6	10	4.20	944/1615	4.20	4.05	4.24	4.37	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	242/1566	4.74	4.05	4.07	4.17	4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	7	0	2	4	2	8	4.00	899/1528	4.00	3.88	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	541/1650	4.52	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	499/1626	4.45	3.86	4.11	4.28	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	572/1559	4.73	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	298/1560	4.95	4.57	4.72	4.80	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	574/1549	4.59	4.10	4.31	4.43	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	231/1546	4.91	4.10	4.32	4.43	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	439/1323	4.39	3.92	4.00	4.10	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	249/1384	4.77	4.02	4.10	4.32	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	306/1378	4.85	4.22	4.29	4.55	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	225/1378	4.92	4.11	4.31	4.60	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	15	8	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	4	Under-grad	25	Non-major	18
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	16				
			? 0						

Course-Section: BIOL 443 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS:DEVEL BIOLO
 Instructor: BREWSTER, RACHE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 234
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	737/1670	4.45	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.09	4.32	4.48	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	317/1615	4.73	4.05	4.24	4.37	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	132/1566	4.91	4.05	4.07	4.17	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	202/1528	4.78	3.88	4.12	4.26	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	720/1650	4.40	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	953/1626	4.06	3.86	4.11	4.28	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.57	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	537/1549	4.63	4.10	4.31	4.43	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	987/1546	4.25	4.10	4.32	4.43	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	448/1323	4.38	3.92	4.00	4.10	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	205/1384	4.83	4.02	4.10	4.32	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.11	4.31	4.60	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	3.98	4.03	4.22	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 443 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS:DEVEL BIOLO
 Instructor: BIEBERICH, CHAR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 235
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	737/1670	4.45	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.09	4.32	4.48	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	317/1615	4.73	4.05	4.24	4.37	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	132/1566	4.91	4.05	4.07	4.17	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	202/1528	4.78	3.88	4.12	4.26	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	720/1650	4.40	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	877/1626	4.06	3.86	4.11	4.28	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.57	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	537/1549	4.63	4.10	4.31	4.43	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	987/1546	4.25	4.10	4.32	4.43	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	448/1323	4.38	3.92	4.00	4.10	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	205/1384	4.83	4.02	4.10	4.32	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.11	4.31	4.60	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	3.98	4.03	4.22	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 456 0101
 Title PLANT MOLECULAR BIOLOG
 Instructor: LU, HUA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 236
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	338/1670	4.78	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	876/1406	4.25	4.09	4.32	4.48	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.05	4.24	4.37	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	364/1566	4.56	4.05	4.07	4.17	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	421/1528	4.50	3.88	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1347/1650	3.78	4.16	4.22	4.28	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	499/1626	4.44	3.86	4.11	4.28	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	323/1559	4.88	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.57	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	852/1549	4.38	4.10	4.31	4.43	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	570/1546	4.63	4.10	4.32	4.43	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	641/1323	4.13	3.92	4.00	4.10	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	221/1384	4.80	4.02	4.10	4.32	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.11	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	202/ 904	4.60	3.98	4.03	4.22	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 457 0101
 Title PHYS:MARINE/EST ANIMAL
 Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 237
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	124/1670	4.94	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	516/1666	4.59	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	576/1406	4.53	4.09	4.32	4.48	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	401/1615	4.65	4.05	4.24	4.37	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	419/1566	4.47	4.05	4.07	4.17	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	211/1528	4.76	3.88	4.12	4.26	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	383/1650	4.65	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	293/1626	4.64	3.86	4.11	4.28	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	166/1559	4.94	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.57	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	439/1549	4.71	4.10	4.31	4.43	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.10	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	178/1323	4.76	3.92	4.00	4.10	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	403/1384	4.56	4.02	4.10	4.32	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	379/1378	4.78	4.22	4.29	4.55	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	417/1378	4.78	4.11	4.31	4.60	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.98	4.03	4.22	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 486 0101
 Title GENOME SCIENCE
 Instructor: BUSTOS, MAURICI
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 238
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1537/1670	3.50	4.26	4.31	4.45	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1470/1666	3.63	4.13	4.27	4.35	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.09	4.32	4.48	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1276/1615	3.83	4.05	4.24	4.37	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1406/1566	3.25	4.05	4.07	4.17	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1482/1528	2.86	3.88	4.12	4.26	2.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1055/1650	4.13	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1458/1667	4.13	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1335/1626	3.63	3.86	4.11	4.28	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1157/1559	4.25	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	1248/1560	4.50	4.57	4.72	4.80	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1389/1549	3.50	4.10	4.31	4.43	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1465/1546	3.13	4.10	4.32	4.43	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1089/1323	3.38	3.92	4.00	4.10	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1260/1384	3.00	4.02	4.10	4.32	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.55	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.11	4.31	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 904	****	3.98	4.03	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101
 Title SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS
 Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 239
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.26	4.31	4.45	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	767/1666	4.42	4.13	4.27	4.35	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	703/1406	4.42	4.09	4.32	4.48	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	874/1615	4.25	4.05	4.24	4.37	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1010/1566	3.91	4.05	4.07	4.17	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	853/1528	4.08	3.88	4.12	4.26	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	2	1	7	4.08	1090/1650	4.08	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	167/1626	4.80	3.86	4.11	4.28	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	536/1560	4.92	4.57	4.72	4.80	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.10	4.31	4.43	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.10	4.32	4.43	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	326/1323	4.50	3.92	4.00	4.10	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.02	4.10	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	718/1378	4.40	4.22	4.29	4.55	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.80	4.11	4.31	4.60	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	373/ 904	4.25	3.98	4.03	4.22	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 232	****	4.52	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 239	****	4.47	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 230	****	4.67	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 231	****	4.49	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 218	****	4.35	4.18	4.09	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 636L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 240
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1670	4.86	4.26	4.31	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	751/1666	4.43	4.13	4.27	4.34	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	691/1406	4.43	4.09	4.32	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	326/1615	4.71	4.05	4.24	4.33	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	258/1566	4.71	4.05	4.07	4.20	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	260/1528	4.71	3.88	4.12	4.33	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	471/1650	4.57	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	239/1626	4.71	3.86	4.11	4.20	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.57	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.10	4.31	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.10	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	144/1323	4.83	3.92	4.00	4.03	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	221/1384	4.80	4.02	4.10	4.21	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	348/1378	4.80	4.22	4.29	4.42	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.80	4.11	4.31	4.51	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.98	4.03	4.04	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	25/ 232	4.86	4.52	4.19	4.30	4.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	56/ 239	4.71	4.47	4.21	4.53	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	53/ 230	4.86	4.67	4.44	4.69	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	100/ 231	4.57	4.49	4.31	4.58	4.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	44/ 218	4.71	4.35	4.18	4.47	4.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.80	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 636L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 240
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 643 0101
 Title ADV TOP IN DEV BIOLOGY
 Instructor: BREWSTER, RACHE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 241
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.26	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.13	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.05	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.05	4.07	4.20	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	899/1528	4.00	3.88	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.16	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1280/1559	4.25	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.57	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	683/1549	4.75	4.10	4.31	4.37	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.10	4.32	4.40	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.92	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.02	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.11	4.31	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.98	4.03	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 643 0101
 Title ADV TOP IN DEV BIOLOGY
 Instructor: BIEBERICH, CHAR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 242
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.26	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.13	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.05	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.05	4.07	4.20	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	899/1528	4.00	3.88	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.16	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	896/1559	4.25	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.57	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	4.75	4.10	4.31	4.37	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.10	4.32	4.40	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	3.92	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.02	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.11	4.31	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	3.98	4.03	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 712 0101
 Title Mentoring in Science
 Instructor: Leips, Jeff
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 17
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	902/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	300/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	488/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	520/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	****	4.95	4.65	4.67	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.72	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	****	4.72	4.45	4.59	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	****	4.22	3.97	3.99	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 750 0101
 Title ORGANISMIC BIOLOGY
 Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYLL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 243
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1670	4.86	4.26	4.31	4.46	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	355/1666	4.71	4.13	4.27	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.09	4.32	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.05	4.24	4.33	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	159/1566	4.86	4.05	4.07	4.20	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1176/1528	3.71	3.88	4.12	4.33	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	471/1650	4.57	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	637/1626	4.33	3.86	4.11	4.20	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.02	4.10	4.21	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.11	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	405/ 904	4.20	3.98	4.03	4.04	4.20	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.61	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	50/ 79	4.67	4.67	4.64	4.67	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	37/ 75	4.80	4.80	4.57	4.66	4.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.58	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	33/ 80	4.33	4.33	3.97	4.32	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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