

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL
 Enrollment: 296
 Questionnaires: 250

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 156
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	7	20	45	81	96	3.96	1194/1576	3.96	4.27	4.30	4.11	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	14	26	54	78	76	3.71	1330/1576	3.71	4.17	4.27	4.18	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	23	22	67	64	71	3.56	1196/1342	3.56	4.05	4.32	4.19	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	79	11	11	42	64	40	3.66	1300/1520	3.66	4.06	4.25	4.09	3.66	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	11	12	6	28	74	115	4.17	738/1465	4.17	4.07	4.12	4.02	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	83	14	13	32	47	58	3.74	1099/1434	3.74	3.85	4.14	3.94	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	12	18	52	70	94	3.88	1167/1547	3.88	3.93	4.19	4.10	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	1	7	236	4.96	188/1574	4.96	4.74	4.64	4.59	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	58	5	16	20	65	65	21	3.29	1378/1554	3.29	3.90	4.10	4.01	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	5	4	21	60	154	4.45	932/1488	4.45	4.44	4.47	4.41	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	5	1	23	43	172	4.54	1176/1493	4.54	4.61	4.73	4.65	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	19	21	53	76	74	3.68	1283/1486	3.68	4.19	4.32	4.26	3.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	2	28	18	44	67	84	3.67	1283/1489	3.67	4.17	4.32	4.22	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	13	18	45	62	98	3.91	802/1277	3.91	4.00	4.03	3.91	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	10	8	32	64	97	4.09	774/1279	4.09	4.10	4.17	3.96	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	9	6	17	43	135	4.38	756/1270	4.38	4.23	4.35	4.09	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	10	8	34	44	112	4.15	876/1269	4.15	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	42	5	10	12	32	62	87	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.79	4.05	3.91	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	239	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	****/ 234	****	4.44	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	239	0	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	239	3	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	****/ 229	****	4.54	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	239	4	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/ 232	****	4.57	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	239	4	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.34	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	240	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	241	4	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	241	6	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	241	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	111	4	0	0	0	0	135	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	245	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	245	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	245	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	245	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	113	0	1	1	0	0	135	4.95	79/ 326	4.95	4.97	4.03	3.64	4.95	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	242	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	241	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	242	2	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	243	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	97	1	0	0	1	1	150	4.98	35/ 382	4.98	4.97	4.08	3.86	4.98	

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL
 Enrollment: 296
 Questionnaires: 250

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 156
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	60	0.00-0.99	0	A	84	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	86
28-55	51	1.00-1.99	0	B	83						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	12	C	37	General	2	Under-grad	250	Non-major	164
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	29	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	77	F	2	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	186				
				?	4						

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 157
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	3	12	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.27	4.30	4.11	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.17	4.27	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.05	4.32	4.19	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	614/1520	4.44	4.06	4.25	4.09	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.07	4.12	4.02	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1015/1434	3.89	3.85	4.14	3.94	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	480/1547	4.55	3.93	4.19	4.10	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.74	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	597/1554	4.36	3.90	4.10	4.01	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	786/1488	4.57	4.44	4.47	4.41	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.61	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	393/1486	4.71	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	789/1489	4.43	4.17	4.32	4.22	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.00	4.03	3.91	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	287/1279	4.73	4.10	4.17	3.96	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	260/1270	4.91	4.23	4.35	4.09	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	375/1269	4.82	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	139/ 878	4.75	3.79	4.05	3.91	4.75	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.92	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.97	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 158
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	8	2	4	3.38	1487/1576	3.52	4.27	4.30	4.11	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	1	7	3.63	1360/1576	3.62	4.17	4.27	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	4	5	3.56	1194/1342	3.19	4.05	4.32	4.19	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	2	4	5	3.44	1388/1520	3.60	4.06	4.25	4.09	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	4	2	5	3.64	1180/1465	3.72	4.07	4.12	4.02	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	5	2	3.06	1368/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	3.94	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	2	6	1	2	2.56	1513/1547	2.87	3.93	4.19	4.10	2.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	972/1574	4.59	4.74	4.64	4.59	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	1431/1554	3.09	3.90	4.10	4.01	3.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	1299/1488	4.15	4.44	4.47	4.41	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	4	0	8	4.08	1404/1493	4.08	4.61	4.73	4.65	4.08	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1078/1486	3.87	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1251/1489	3.63	4.17	4.32	4.22	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	5	1	4	3.50	1020/1277	3.45	4.00	4.03	3.91	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	745/1279	3.43	4.10	4.17	3.96	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1121/1270	3.19	4.23	4.35	4.09	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	928/1269	3.32	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	799/ 878	2.87	3.79	4.05	3.91	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	23/ 234	4.11	4.44	4.23	4.08	4.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 240	4.16	4.53	4.35	4.29	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 229	4.45	4.54	4.51	4.43	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	93/ 232	4.41	4.57	4.29	4.27	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	99/ 379	4.10	4.34	4.20	4.15	4.43	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 375	4.75	4.92	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	4.86	4.97	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 382	4.86	4.97	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 12		
				? 0			

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0103
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 159
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1283/1576	3.52	4.27	4.30	4.11	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1326/1576	3.62	4.17	4.27	4.18	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1209/1342	3.19	4.05	4.32	4.19	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	511/1520	3.60	4.06	4.25	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	175/1465	3.72	4.07	4.12	4.02	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	777/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	3.94	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1396/1547	2.87	3.93	4.19	4.10	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	911/1574	4.59	4.74	4.64	4.59	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1227/1554	3.09	3.90	4.10	4.01	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1171/1488	4.15	4.44	4.47	4.41	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	1384/1493	4.08	4.61	4.73	4.65	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1233/1486	3.87	4.19	4.32	4.26	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	997/1489	3.63	4.17	4.32	4.22	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	692/1277	3.45	4.00	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1279	3.43	4.10	4.17	3.96	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	784/1270	3.19	4.23	4.35	4.09	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	444/1269	3.32	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	631/ 878	2.87	3.79	4.05	3.91	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 234	4.11	4.44	4.23	4.08	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	162/ 240	4.16	4.53	4.35	4.29	4.20	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 229	4.45	4.54	4.51	4.43	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 232	4.41	4.57	4.29	4.27	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 379	4.10	4.34	4.20	4.15	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 375	4.75	4.92	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	46/ 52	3.00	3.00	4.48	4.20	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	43/ 48	3.00	3.00	4.40	4.11	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	4.86	4.97	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	38/ 40	3.00	3.00	4.60	4.44	3.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	4.86	4.97	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0103
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 159
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0105
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 160
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	1	4	4	3.75	1345/1576	3.52	4.27	4.30	4.11	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	5	4	3.75	1311/1576	3.62	4.17	4.27	4.18	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	1	1	4	2	3.09	1287/1342	3.19	4.05	4.32	4.19	3.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	2	3.67	1300/1520	3.60	4.06	4.25	4.09	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	6	3	3.75	1102/1465	3.72	4.07	4.12	4.02	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	4	3	3.33	1289/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	3.94	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	3	2	3.25	1413/1547	2.87	3.93	4.19	4.10	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	422/1574	4.59	4.74	4.64	4.59	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.09	3.90	4.10	4.01	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1307/1488	4.15	4.44	4.47	4.41	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	7	4	4.08	1403/1493	4.08	4.61	4.73	4.65	4.08
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1222/1486	3.87	4.19	4.32	4.26	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1363/1489	3.63	4.17	4.32	4.22	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	2	2	3	2	2.92	1189/1277	3.45	4.00	4.03	3.91	2.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1229/1279	3.43	4.10	4.17	3.96	2.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1208/1270	3.19	4.23	4.35	4.09	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	773/1269	3.32	4.16	4.35	4.09	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	858/ 878	2.87	3.79	4.05	3.91	2.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	201/ 234	4.11	4.44	4.23	4.08	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	198/ 240	4.16	4.53	4.35	4.29	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	123/ 229	4.45	4.54	4.51	4.43	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	96/ 232	4.41	4.57	4.29	4.27	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	329/ 379	4.10	4.34	4.20	4.15	3.89
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 375	4.75	4.92	4.01	3.78	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	3.00	3.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	3.00	3.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	4.86	4.97	4.03	3.64	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	3.00	3.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 382	4.86	4.97	4.08	3.86	5.00

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0105
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 160
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0107
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 161
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	3	7	1	3.20	1509/1576	3.52	4.27	4.30	4.11	3.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	6	3	3.40	1438/1576	3.62	4.17	4.27	4.18	3.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	5	1	3.00	1294/1342	3.19	4.05	4.32	4.19	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	3	4	3	3.36	1413/1520	3.60	4.06	4.25	4.09	3.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	3	6	0	2.73	1433/1465	3.72	4.07	4.12	4.02	2.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	6	2	3.27	1310/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	3.94	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	4	3	3	1	2.64	1507/1547	2.87	3.93	4.19	4.10	2.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	1128/1574	4.59	4.74	4.64	4.59	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	3	1	1	6	1	3.08	1434/1554	3.09	3.90	4.10	4.01	3.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	1072/1488	4.15	4.44	4.47	4.41	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	1387/1493	4.08	4.61	4.73	4.65	4.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1177/1486	3.87	4.19	4.32	4.26	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1218/1489	3.63	4.17	4.32	4.22	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	2	7	2	3.62	968/1277	3.45	4.00	4.03	3.91	3.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1186/1279	3.43	4.10	4.17	3.96	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1169/1270	3.19	4.23	4.35	4.09	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	1259/1269	3.32	4.16	4.35	4.09	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	861/ 878	2.87	3.79	4.05	3.91	2.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	219/ 234	4.11	4.44	4.23	4.08	3.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	233/ 240	4.16	4.53	4.35	4.29	3.11	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	2	1	3	2	1	2.89	228/ 229	4.45	4.54	4.51	4.43	2.89	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	213/ 232	4.41	4.57	4.29	4.27	3.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	1	3	0	4	3.56	360/ 379	4.10	4.34	4.20	4.15	3.56	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	176/ 375	4.75	4.92	4.01	3.78	4.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	3.00	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	3.00	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	4.86	4.97	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	3.00	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	4.86	4.97	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0107
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 161
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0203
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 162
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1345/1576	3.52	4.27	4.30	4.11	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1058/1576	3.62	4.17	4.27	4.18	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	1285/1342	3.19	4.05	4.32	4.19	3.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1199/1520	3.60	4.06	4.25	4.09	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1102/1465	3.72	4.07	4.12	4.02	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1162/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	3.94	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	2	1	2	2.88	1488/1547	2.87	3.93	4.19	4.10	2.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1079/1574	4.59	4.74	4.64	4.59	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1524/1554	3.09	3.90	4.10	4.01	2.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1087/1488	4.15	4.44	4.47	4.41	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1344/1493	4.08	4.61	4.73	4.65	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1313/1486	3.87	4.19	4.32	4.26	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1415/1489	3.63	4.17	4.32	4.22	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.45	4.00	4.03	3.91	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1229/1279	3.43	4.10	4.17	3.96	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1258/1270	3.19	4.23	4.35	4.09	2.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1210/1269	3.32	4.16	4.35	4.09	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	849/ 878	2.87	3.79	4.05	3.91	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	138/ 234	4.11	4.44	4.23	4.08	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	122/ 240	4.16	4.53	4.35	4.29	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	54/ 229	4.45	4.54	4.51	4.43	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	151/ 232	4.41	4.57	4.29	4.27	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	364/ 379	4.10	4.34	4.20	4.15	3.40	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	4.75	4.92	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	4.86	4.97	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	4.86	4.97	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0204
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 163
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	3	7	2	3.47	1459/1576	3.52	4.27	4.30	4.11	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	6	2	3.60	1368/1576	3.62	4.17	4.27	4.18	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	6	1	3.13	1284/1342	3.19	4.05	4.32	4.19	3.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	4	3	3.40	1400/1520	3.60	4.06	4.25	4.09	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	768/1465	3.72	4.07	4.12	4.02	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1204/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	3.94	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	4	4	0	2.79	1498/1547	2.87	3.93	4.19	4.10	2.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1025/1574	4.59	4.74	4.64	4.59	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	4	4	1	3.25	1390/1554	3.09	3.90	4.10	4.01	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	870/1488	4.15	4.44	4.47	4.41	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	1390/1493	4.08	4.61	4.73	4.65	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1039/1486	3.87	4.19	4.32	4.26	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	5	4	3.71	1270/1489	3.63	4.17	4.32	4.22	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	780/1277	3.45	4.00	4.03	3.91	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	5	1	3.56	1043/1279	3.43	4.10	4.17	3.96	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	3	2	1	1	2.56	1247/1270	3.19	4.23	4.35	4.09	2.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	1	3	3	0	2.60	1246/1269	3.32	4.16	4.35	4.09	2.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	2	1	1	5	0	3.00	799/ 878	2.87	3.79	4.05	3.91	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	112/ 234	4.11	4.44	4.23	4.08	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	106/ 240	4.16	4.53	4.35	4.29	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	74/ 229	4.45	4.54	4.51	4.43	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	113/ 232	4.41	4.57	4.29	4.27	4.45
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	148/ 379	4.10	4.34	4.20	4.15	4.27
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	4.75	4.92	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 326	4.86	4.97	4.03	3.64	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	4.86	4.97	4.08	3.86	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0205
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 164
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	4	7	3	3.53	1438/1576	3.52	4.27	4.30	4.11	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	5	0	7	3.53	1387/1576	3.62	4.17	4.27	4.18	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	6	4	5	2	3.18	1281/1342	3.19	4.05	4.32	4.19	3.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	3	3	3.24	1442/1520	3.60	4.06	4.25	4.09	3.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	6	4	3	3.44	1277/1465	3.72	4.07	4.12	4.02	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	3	4	3	2.94	1387/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	3.94	2.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	6	3	2	2.88	1487/1547	2.87	3.93	4.19	4.10	2.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	1018/1574	4.59	4.74	4.64	4.59	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	3	5	3	1	3.00	1448/1554	3.09	3.90	4.10	4.01	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1215/1488	4.15	4.44	4.47	4.41	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	1449/1493	4.08	4.61	4.73	4.65	3.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	9	4	3.94	1168/1486	3.87	4.19	4.32	4.26	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	6	4	3.60	1298/1489	3.63	4.17	4.32	4.22	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1056/1277	3.45	4.00	4.03	3.91	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	1173/1279	3.43	4.10	4.17	3.96	3.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	0	1	3	3	3.30	1175/1270	3.19	4.23	4.35	4.09	3.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	3	1	2	3.00	1210/1269	3.32	4.16	4.35	4.09	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	3	0	0	3	3.14	788/ 878	2.87	3.79	4.05	3.91	3.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	140/ 234	4.11	4.44	4.23	4.08	4.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	207/ 240	4.16	4.53	4.35	4.29	3.92	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	185/ 229	4.45	4.54	4.51	4.43	4.25	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	36/ 232	4.41	4.57	4.29	4.27	4.91	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	148/ 379	4.10	4.34	4.20	4.15	4.27	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.43	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	152/ 375	4.75	4.92	4.01	3.78	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	3.00	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	3.00	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	148/ 326	4.86	4.97	4.03	3.64	4.43	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	3.00	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	178/ 382	4.86	4.97	4.08	3.86	4.56	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0205
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 164
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	10				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 165
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	0	3	5	2	3.23	1506/1576	3.52	4.27	4.30	4.11	3.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	9	2	1	3.23	1488/1576	3.62	4.17	4.27	4.18	3.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	2	2	2.93	1311/1342	3.19	4.05	4.32	4.19	2.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	1427/1520	3.60	4.06	4.25	4.09	3.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	2	4	3.50	1242/1465	3.72	4.07	4.12	4.02	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	6	1	3.21	1322/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	3.94	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	6	2	0	2.64	1507/1547	2.87	3.93	4.19	4.10	2.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	1177/1574	4.59	4.74	4.64	4.59	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	5	3	0	3.11	1428/1554	3.09	3.90	4.10	4.01	3.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	5	6	4.08	1212/1488	4.15	4.44	4.47	4.41	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	1435/1493	4.08	4.61	4.73	4.65	3.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1276/1486	3.87	4.19	4.32	4.26	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	6	3	3.54	1308/1489	3.63	4.17	4.32	4.22	3.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	3	1	5	1	3.18	1123/1277	3.45	4.00	4.03	3.91	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1097/1279	3.43	4.10	4.17	3.96	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	3	0	2	3.14	1194/1270	3.19	4.23	4.35	4.09	3.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	3	2	0	2.86	1233/1269	3.32	4.16	4.35	4.09	2.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	799/ 878	2.87	3.79	4.05	3.91	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	2	0	4	5	1	3.25	224/ 234	4.11	4.44	4.23	4.08	3.25	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	171/ 240	4.16	4.53	4.35	4.29	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	151/ 229	4.45	4.54	4.51	4.43	4.42	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	144/ 232	4.41	4.57	4.29	4.27	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	229/ 379	4.10	4.34	4.20	4.15	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 375	4.75	4.92	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	3.00	3.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	3.00	3.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 326	4.86	4.97	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	3.00	3.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	177/ 382	4.86	4.97	4.08	3.86	4.60	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 165
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 123 0101
 Title HUMAN GENETICS
 Instructor: AKINMADE, DAMIL
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 166
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	6	9	6	3.68	1374/1576	3.68	4.27	4.30	4.11	3.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	3	8	7	3.52	1387/1576	3.52	4.17	4.27	4.18	3.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	6	3	6	6	3.16	1282/1342	3.16	4.05	4.32	4.19	3.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	6	3	9	5	3.46	1381/1520	3.46	4.06	4.25	4.09	3.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	9	7	3.68	1152/1465	3.68	4.07	4.12	4.02	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	5	3	11	3	3.33	1289/1434	3.33	3.85	4.14	3.94	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	8	8	5	3.56	1320/1547	3.56	3.93	4.19	4.10	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	422/1574	4.92	4.74	4.64	4.59	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	1	8	6	2	3.26	1387/1554	3.26	3.90	4.10	4.01	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	907/1488	4.48	4.44	4.47	4.41	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	1029/1493	4.68	4.61	4.73	4.65	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	4	5	5	5	3.33	1375/1486	3.33	4.19	4.32	4.26	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	5	4	5	6	3.48	1322/1489	3.48	4.17	4.32	4.22	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	2	3	7	9	4.10	656/1277	4.10	4.00	4.03	3.91	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	3.96	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.09	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.09	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	3.91	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.92	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.97	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0

			Required for Majors	18	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	25
			Other	2	Major
					Non-major
					25
					0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 216H 0101
 Title PHAGE HUNTERS II
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 167
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	893/1576	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	668/1576	4.46	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	286/1342	4.77	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	173/1520	4.85	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	813/1465	4.08	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	338/1434	4.58	3.85	4.14	4.06	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	784/1547	4.31	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	866/1574	4.69	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	463/1554	4.64	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	484/1488	4.81	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	708/1493	4.85	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	325/1486	4.81	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	742/1489	4.52	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	489/1277	4.30	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	899/1279	3.90	4.10	4.17	4.14	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.23	4.35	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.16	4.35	4.29	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	589/ 878	3.83	3.79	4.05	3.92	3.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	112/ 234	4.36	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	29/ 240	4.91	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	203/ 229	4.00	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.38	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	27/ 379	4.91	4.34	4.20	4.29	4.91	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.97	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 216H 0101
 Title PHAGE HUNTERS II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 168
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	893/1576	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	668/1576	4.46	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	286/1342	4.77	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	173/1520	4.85	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	813/1465	4.08	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	338/1434	4.58	3.85	4.14	4.06	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	784/1547	4.31	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	866/1574	4.69	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	298/1554	4.64	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	324/1488	4.81	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	683/1493	4.85	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.81	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	614/1489	4.52	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	506/1277	4.30	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	899/1279	3.90	4.10	4.17	4.14	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.23	4.35	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.16	4.35	4.29	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	589/ 878	3.83	3.79	4.05	3.92	3.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	112/ 234	4.36	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	29/ 240	4.91	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	203/ 229	4.00	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.38	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	27/ 379	4.91	4.34	4.20	4.29	4.91	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.97	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 216H 0101
 Title PHAGE HUNTERS II
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 169
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	893/1576	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	668/1576	4.46	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	286/1342	4.77	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	173/1520	4.85	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	813/1465	4.08	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	338/1434	4.58	3.85	4.14	4.06	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	784/1547	4.31	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	866/1574	4.69	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1554	4.64	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.64	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1493	4.85	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	899/1279	3.90	4.10	4.17	4.14	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.23	4.35	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.16	4.35	4.29	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	589/ 878	3.83	3.79	4.05	3.92	3.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	112/ 234	4.36	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	29/ 240	4.91	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.91	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	203/ 229	4.00	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.38	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	27/ 379	4.91	4.34	4.20	4.29	4.91	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.97	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	6	11	68	4.73	335/1576	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	2	15	31	36	4.16	1023/1576	4.16	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	7	9	38	28	3.99	991/1342	3.99	4.05	4.32	4.41	3.99	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	57	2	1	8	9	6	3.62	1325/1520	3.62	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	12	0	3	7	18	43	4.42	483/1465	4.42	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	67	1	2	0	4	8	4.07	****/1434	****	3.85	4.14	4.06	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	4	9	20	51	4.40	690/1547	4.40	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	20	64	4.76	739/1574	4.76	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	3	8	28	32	4.25	712/1554	4.25	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	4	5	23	50	4.45	932/1488	4.45	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	3	9	69	4.78	849/1493	4.78	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	3	10	26	43	4.33	901/1486	4.33	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	9	8	63	4.61	579/1489	4.61	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	27	1	4	8	11	29	4.19	593/1277	4.19	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	81	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	81	0	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	81	0	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.29	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	85	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.44	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	85	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	85	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.54	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	85	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 232	****	4.57	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	85	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	****	4.34	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	72	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.92	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	71	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.97	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	0	45	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	21
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	44
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	4	C	8
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	24	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	4

			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	4	Under-grad
			Electives	5	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			Other	67	

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 171
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	359/1576	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	502/1576	4.63	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	562/1342	4.58	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	4	5	5	3.75	1256/1520	4.11	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	328/1465	4.56	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	6	3	4	3.44	1245/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	4.06	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	503/1547	4.55	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	281/1574	4.93	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	395/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	385/1488	4.58	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	784/1493	4.70	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	0	1	8	4.36	861/1486	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	539/1489	4.63	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1277	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	26/ 234	4.75	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.82	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 240	4.88	4.53	4.35	4.47	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	34/ 229	4.79	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.91	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	47/ 232	4.79	4.57	4.29	4.38	4.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 379	4.83	4.34	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 171
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	13
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	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	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 172
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	359/1576	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	502/1576	4.63	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	562/1342	4.58	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	4	5	5	3.75	1256/1520	4.11	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	328/1465	4.56	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	6	3	4	3.44	1245/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	4.06	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	503/1547	4.55	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	281/1574	4.93	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	924/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/1488	4.58	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/1493	4.70	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1486	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1489	4.63	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	26/ 234	4.75	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.82	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 240	4.88	4.53	4.35	4.47	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	34/ 229	4.79	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.91	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	47/ 232	4.79	4.57	4.29	4.38	4.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 379	4.83	4.34	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 172
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	13
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	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	15				
				?	1						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 173
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	1	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	595/1576	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	301/1576	4.63	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	633/1342	4.58	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1153/1520	4.11	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	366/1465	4.56	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	2	1	3	4	3.23	1317/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	4.06	3.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	411/1547	4.55	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	547/1574	4.93	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1405/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1488	4.58	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1493	4.70	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1486	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1489	4.63	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	63/ 234	4.75	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	26/ 240	4.88	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.92	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	67/ 229	4.79	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	32/ 232	4.79	4.57	4.29	4.38	4.92	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.83	4.34	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.39	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	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
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 0201
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 174
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	1	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	595/1576	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	301/1576	4.63	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	633/1342	4.58	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1153/1520	4.11	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	366/1465	4.56	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	2	1	3	4	3.23	1317/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	4.06	3.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	411/1547	4.55	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	547/1574	4.93	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	849/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	982/1488	4.58	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	1278/1493	4.70	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	678/1486	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	801/1489	4.63	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	818/1277	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	63/ 234	4.75	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	26/ 240	4.88	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.92	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	67/ 229	4.79	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	32/ 232	4.79	4.57	4.29	4.38	4.92	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.83	4.34	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.39	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	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	0						
						Other	12				

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 175
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	595/1576	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	301/1576	4.63	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	633/1342	4.58	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1153/1520	4.11	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	366/1465	4.56	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	2	1	3	4	3.23	1317/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	4.06	3.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	411/1547	4.55	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	547/1574	4.93	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	8	2	3.69	1214/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1209/1488	4.58	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1142/1493	4.70	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1025/1486	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	602/1489	4.63	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	818/1277	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	63/ 234	4.75	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	26/ 240	4.88	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.92	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	67/ 229	4.79	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	32/ 232	4.79	4.57	4.29	4.38	4.92	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.83	4.34	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	12

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0301
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 176
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	0	3	17	4.85	203/1576	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	476/1576	4.63	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	240/1342	4.58	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	511/1520	4.11	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	353/1465	4.56	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	2	4	9	3.94	953/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	4.06	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	445/1547	4.55	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574	4.93	4.74	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	6	12	4.53	379/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	547/1488	4.58	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	849/1493	4.70	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	642/1486	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	364/1489	4.63	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	385/1277	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.29	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	23/ 234	4.75	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	65/ 240	4.88	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.69	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	46/ 229	4.79	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.85	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	45/ 232	4.79	4.57	4.29	4.38	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	7	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	34/ 379	4.83	4.34	4.20	4.29	4.83	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0301
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 177
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	0	3	17	4.85	203/1576	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	476/1576	4.63	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	240/1342	4.58	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	511/1520	4.11	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	353/1465	4.56	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	2	4	9	3.94	953/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	4.06	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	445/1547	4.55	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1574	4.93	4.74	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	805/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	505/1488	4.58	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	4.70	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	251/1489	4.63	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1277	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.29	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	23/ 234	4.75	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	65/ 240	4.88	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.69	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	46/ 229	4.79	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.85	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	45/ 232	4.79	4.57	4.29	4.38	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	7	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	34/ 379	4.83	4.34	4.20	4.29	4.83	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0401
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 178
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	0	2	12	4.86	203/1576	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	515/1576	4.63	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	510/1342	4.58	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	805/1520	4.11	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	277/1465	4.56	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	1	3	4	3.15	1342/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	4.06	3.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	527/1547	4.55	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	375/1574	4.93	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	518/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.58	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	734/1493	4.70	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	500/1489	4.63	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.29	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	27/ 234	4.75	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	29/ 240	4.88	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.90	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	83/ 229	4.79	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	90/ 232	4.79	4.57	4.29	4.38	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 379	4.83	4.34	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0401
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 179
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	203/1576	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	515/1576	4.63	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	510/1342	4.58	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	805/1520	4.11	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	277/1465	4.56	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	1	3	4	3.15	1342/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	4.06	3.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	527/1547	4.55	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	375/1574	4.93	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	742/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	870/1488	4.58	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1150/1493	4.70	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	596/1486	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	614/1489	4.63	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1277	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.29	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	27/ 234	4.75	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	29/ 240	4.88	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.90	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	83/ 229	4.79	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	90/ 232	4.79	4.57	4.29	4.38	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 379	4.83	4.34	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0401
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 180
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	0	2	12	4.86	203/1576	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	515/1576	4.63	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	510/1342	4.58	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	805/1520	4.11	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	277/1465	4.56	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	1	3	4	3.15	1342/1434	3.39	3.85	4.14	4.06	3.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	527/1547	4.55	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	375/1574	4.93	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	623/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	870/1488	4.58	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1150/1493	4.70	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	596/1486	4.55	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	614/1489	4.63	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1277	4.06	4.00	4.03	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.29	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	27/ 234	4.75	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	29/ 240	4.88	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.90	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	83/ 229	4.79	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	90/ 232	4.79	4.57	4.29	4.38	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 379	4.83	4.34	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 275 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 162
 Questionnaires: 89

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 181
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	4	5	12	17	47	4.15	1050/1576	4.15	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	17	15	22	28	3.65	1352/1576	3.65	4.17	4.27	4.32	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	8	10	19	25	22	3.51	1206/1342	3.51	4.05	4.32	4.41	3.51	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	53	5	2	10	4	10	3.39	1405/1520	3.39	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	12	8	8	13	14	29	3.67	1166/1465	3.67	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	65	5	1	1	5	7	3.42	****/1434	****	3.85	4.14	4.06	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	7	7	17	27	25	3.67	1272/1547	3.67	3.93	4.19	4.22	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	5	79	4.94	281/1574	4.94	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	5	9	20	19	26	3.66	1234/1554	3.66	3.90	4.10	4.05	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	3	13	26	41	4.19	1160/1488	4.19	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	4	7	15	59	4.48	1232/1493	4.48	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	9	10	15	24	27	3.59	1311/1486	3.59	4.19	4.32	4.29	3.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	10	7	11	16	41	3.84	1222/1489	3.84	4.17	4.32	4.31	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	11	6	5	12	19	29	3.85	834/1277	3.85	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	69	0	1	1	8	4	6	3.65	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	69	0	0	2	6	6	6	3.80	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	69	0	0	1	7	4	8	3.95	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	69	17	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	82	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	****/ 234	****	4.44	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	84	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	85	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 229	****	4.54	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	84	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 232	****	4.57	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	85	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/ 379	****	4.34	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	87	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	88	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	1	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	88	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	65	0	1	0	0	0	23	4.83	135/ 326	4.83	4.97	4.03	4.43	4.83	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	88	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	88	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	60	1	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Course-Section: BIOL 275 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 162
 Questionnaires: 89

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 181
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	21
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	30						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	8	C	28	General	15	Under-grad	88	Non-major	68
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	14	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	54				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 182
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	5	13	4.72	335/1576	4.49	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	7	6	4.06	1107/1576	4.22	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	819/1342	4.20	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	707/1520	4.22	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	768/1465	3.96	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	852/1434	4.07	3.85	4.14	4.06	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	3	8	4	3.72	1251/1547	3.60	3.93	4.19	4.22	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	987/1574	4.73	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	805/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	907/1488	4.57	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1493	4.78	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	973/1486	4.16	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	927/1489	4.28	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	446/1277	4.02	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	603/1279	4.28	4.10	4.17	4.14	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	505/1270	4.50	4.23	4.35	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	353/1269	4.51	4.16	4.35	4.29	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 878	4.13	3.79	4.05	3.92	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	19/ 234	4.54	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	165/ 240	4.41	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.18
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	143/ 229	4.52	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	152/ 232	4.29	4.57	4.29	4.38	4.18
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	229/ 379	4.13	4.34	4.20	4.29	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 375	4.78	4.92	4.01	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	4.94	4.97	4.03	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 382	4.98	4.97	4.08	4.39	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 182
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0201
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 183
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	757/1576	4.49	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	9	4.19	996/1576	4.22	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	11	5	3.90	1068/1342	4.20	4.05	4.32	4.41	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	921/1520	4.22	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	6	5	5	3.76	1095/1465	3.96	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	6	7	3.95	941/1434	4.07	3.85	4.14	4.06	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	7	8	4.05	1013/1547	3.60	3.93	4.19	4.22	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	4.48	1115/1574	4.73	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.48	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	897/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	12	8	4.33	1048/1488	4.57	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	986/1493	4.78	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	2	8	8	4.00	1101/1486	4.16	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	1065/1489	4.28	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	5	5	1	4	3.27	1104/1277	4.02	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	575/1279	4.28	4.10	4.17	4.14	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	827/1270	4.50	4.23	4.35	4.30	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	444/1269	4.51	4.16	4.35	4.29	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	654/ 878	4.13	3.79	4.05	3.92	3.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	61/ 234	4.54	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	180/ 240	4.41	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	172/ 229	4.52	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	123/ 232	4.29	4.57	4.29	4.38	4.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	152/ 379	4.13	4.34	4.20	4.29	4.27	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	171/ 375	4.78	4.92	4.01	4.21	4.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	135/ 326	4.94	4.97	4.03	4.43	4.83	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	171/ 382	4.98	4.97	4.08	4.39	4.91	

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0201
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 183
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0301
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 184
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	500/1576	4.49	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	759/1576	4.22	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	658/1342	4.20	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	6	12	4.47	562/1520	4.22	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	850/1465	3.96	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	473/1434	4.07	3.85	4.14	4.06	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	5	7	4	3.61	1298/1547	3.60	3.93	4.19	4.22	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1574	4.73	4.74	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	490/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	355/1488	4.57	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	607/1493	4.78	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	763/1486	4.16	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	500/1489	4.28	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	506/1277	4.02	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	244/1279	4.28	4.10	4.17	4.14	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	505/1270	4.50	4.23	4.35	4.30	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	535/1269	4.51	4.16	4.35	4.29	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	129/ 878	4.13	3.79	4.05	3.92	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	50/ 234	4.54	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	60/ 240	4.41	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.72	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	93/ 229	4.52	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	0	6	11	4.50	103/ 232	4.29	4.57	4.29	4.38	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	111/ 379	4.13	4.34	4.20	4.29	4.39	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 375	4.78	4.92	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 326	4.94	4.97	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 382	4.98	4.97	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0301
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 184
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	17
84-150	5	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	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0401
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 185
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	1000/1576	4.49	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	6	8	4.05	1107/1576	4.22	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	3	10	4.16	905/1342	4.20	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	3	7	5	3.78	1246/1520	4.22	4.06	4.25	4.26	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	3	3	3	5	3.71	1130/1465	3.96	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	6	5	6	3.83	1045/1434	4.07	3.85	4.14	4.06	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	6	1	4	5	2	2.78	1498/1547	3.60	3.93	4.19	4.22	2.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	281/1574	4.73	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	5	6	5	3.82	1117/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	945/1488	4.57	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	1210/1493	4.78	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	1061/1486	4.16	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1091/1489	4.28	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	758/1277	4.02	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1014/1279	4.28	4.10	4.17	4.14	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.23	4.35	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	999/1269	4.51	4.16	4.35	4.29	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	709/ 878	4.13	3.79	4.05	3.92	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	173/ 234	4.54	4.44	4.23	4.44	3.93	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	145/ 240	4.41	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.27	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	154/ 229	4.52	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	3	1	2	2	7	3.60	200/ 232	4.29	4.57	4.29	4.38	3.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	2	2	4	4	3	3.27	367/ 379	4.13	4.34	4.20	4.29	3.27	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 375	4.78	4.92	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 326	4.94	4.97	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	4.98	4.97	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0401
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 185
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0501
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 186
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	697/1576	4.49	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	759/1576	4.22	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	879/1342	4.20	4.05	4.32	4.41	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	826/1520	4.22	4.06	4.25	4.26	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	738/1465	3.96	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	848/1434	4.07	3.85	4.14	4.06	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	1182/1547	3.60	3.93	4.19	4.22	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	987/1574	4.73	4.74	4.64	4.62	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	871/1554	4.12	3.90	4.10	4.05	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	505/1488	4.57	4.44	4.47	4.44	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	708/1493	4.78	4.61	4.73	4.75	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1101/1486	4.16	4.19	4.32	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	921/1489	4.28	4.17	4.32	4.31	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	515/1277	4.02	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	641/1279	4.28	4.10	4.17	4.14	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	716/1270	4.50	4.23	4.35	4.30	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	711/1269	4.51	4.16	4.35	4.29	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	221/ 878	4.13	3.79	4.05	3.92	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	59/ 234	4.54	4.44	4.23	4.44	4.62	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	52/ 240	4.41	4.53	4.35	4.47	4.77	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	64/ 229	4.52	4.54	4.51	4.65	4.77	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	55/ 232	4.29	4.57	4.29	4.38	4.77	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	44/ 379	4.13	4.34	4.20	4.29	4.75	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	4.78	4.92	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	4.94	4.97	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 382	4.98	4.97	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	2	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		11		
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: OMLAND, KEVIN E (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 247
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 187
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	7	18	44	4.54	595/1576	4.54	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	9	24	36	4.39	772/1576	4.39	4.17	4.27	4.28	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	8	18	42	4.46	633/1342	4.46	4.05	4.32	4.30	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	26	1	3	10	9	19	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	7	3	13	15	27	3.80	1067/1465	3.80	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	32	2	4	3	8	16	3.97	928/1434	3.97	3.85	4.14	4.15	3.97	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	2	3	15	45	4.53	492/1547	4.53	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	4	60	4.94	328/1574	4.94	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	3	1	1	15	23	9	3.78	1152/1554	4.04	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	2	6	12	42	4.52	858/1488	4.62	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	3	4	54	4.84	734/1493	4.81	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	7	25	29	4.36	861/1486	4.45	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	3	5	18	36	4.40	813/1489	4.44	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	3	4	7	10	33	4.16	615/1277	4.34	4.00	4.03	4.11	4.34	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	46	0	2	0	4	3	17	4.27	657/1279	4.27	4.10	4.17	4.20	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	45	0	0	1	2	3	21	4.63	541/1270	4.63	4.23	4.35	4.42	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	45	0	0	1	2	3	21	4.63	567/1269	4.63	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	45	9	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	355/ 878	4.28	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.28	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.35	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.69	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	71	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.97	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 1	A 33	Required for Majors	3
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 0	B 23		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General	3
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		Under-grad 72
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 24	F 0	Electives	0
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	53	
?	1			

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 247
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 188
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	0	0	0	7	18	44	4.54	595/1576	4.54	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	9	24	36	4.39	772/1576	4.39	4.17	4.27	4.28	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	8	18	42	4.46	633/1342	4.46	4.05	4.32	4.30	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	26	1	3	10	9	19	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	7	3	13	15	27	3.80	1067/1465	3.80	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	32	2	4	3	8	16	3.97	928/1434	3.97	3.85	4.14	4.15	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	2	3	15	45	4.53	492/1547	4.53	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	4	60	4.94	328/1574	4.94	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	0	1	6	20	24	4.31	649/1554	4.04	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	1	3	8	46	4.71	610/1488	4.62	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	2	5	49	4.84	734/1493	4.81	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	5	11	38	4.61	545/1486	4.45	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	3	4	7	41	4.56	625/1489	4.44	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	4	1	1	5	9	34	4.48	328/1277	4.34	4.00	4.03	4.11	4.34
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	46	0	2	0	4	3	17	4.27	657/1279	4.27	4.10	4.17	4.20	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	45	0	0	1	2	3	21	4.63	541/1270	4.63	4.23	4.35	4.42	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	45	0	0	1	2	3	21	4.63	567/1269	4.63	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	45	9	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	355/ 878	4.28	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.28
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.35	4.32	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.69	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	71	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.97	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 1	A 33	Required for Majors	3
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 0	B 23		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General	3
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		Under-grad 72
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 24	F 0	Electives	0
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	53	
?	1			

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 247
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 189
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	7	18	44	4.54	595/1576	4.54	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	9	24	36	4.39	772/1576	4.39	4.17	4.27	4.28	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	8	18	42	4.46	633/1342	4.46	4.05	4.32	4.30	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	26	1	3	10	9	19	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	7	3	13	15	27	3.80	1067/1465	3.80	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	32	2	4	3	8	16	3.97	928/1434	3.97	3.85	4.14	4.15	3.97	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	2	3	15	45	4.53	492/1547	4.53	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	4	60	4.94	328/1574	4.94	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	1	0	0	12	22	14	4.04	902/1554	4.04	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	0	3	13	36	4.63	708/1488	4.62	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	3	6	42	4.76	888/1493	4.81	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	1	8	12	29	4.38	841/1486	4.45	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	9	7	32	4.36	856/1489	4.44	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	4	1	1	5	10	27	4.39	421/1277	4.34	4.00	4.03	4.11	4.34	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	46	0	2	0	4	3	17	4.27	657/1279	4.27	4.10	4.17	4.20	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	45	0	0	1	2	3	21	4.63	541/1270	4.63	4.23	4.35	4.42	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	45	0	0	1	2	3	21	4.63	567/1269	4.63	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	45	9	1	1	2	2	12	4.28	355/ 878	4.28	3.79	4.05	4.09	4.28	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.35	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.69	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	71	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.97	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 1	A 33	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 28
28-55	10	1.00-1.99 0	B 23		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General 3	Under-grad 72 Non-major 44
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 24	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	53	
?	1			

Course-Section: BIOL 302 0101
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI
 Instructor: EISENMANN, DAVI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 237
 Questionnaires: 134

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 190
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	20	43	64	4.23	988/1576	4.23	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	7	34	53	38	3.90	1237/1576	3.90	4.17	4.27	4.28	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	8	39	40	42	3.81	1105/1342	3.81	4.05	4.32	4.30	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	79	1	4	12	13	24	4.02	1036/1520	4.02	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.02	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	11	12	30	32	39	3.61	1201/1465	3.61	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	95	3	1	6	11	13	3.88	1015/1434	3.88	3.85	4.14	4.15	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	2	6	4	30	32	56	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	1	28	97	4.76	739/1574	4.76	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	34	2	0	1	11	59	27	4.14	827/1554	3.83	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	6	32	94	4.64	708/1488	4.47	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	5	21	105	4.71	986/1493	4.61	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	14	50	66	4.35	881/1486	3.99	4.19	4.32	4.32	3.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	3	11	38	76	4.36	867/1489	4.12	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	4	3	15	31	72	4.31	480/1277	4.18	4.00	4.03	4.11	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	93	0	14	5	6	7	9	2.80	1224/1279	2.80	4.10	4.17	4.20	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	92	0	5	4	11	6	16	3.57	1121/1270	3.57	4.23	4.35	4.42	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	93	0	6	2	12	7	14	3.51	1113/1269	3.51	4.16	4.35	4.41	3.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	94	22	2	3	5	2	6	3.39	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.44	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.54	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	132	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 232	****	4.57	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	132	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.34	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	132	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	132	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	0	0	0	0	0	83	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	132	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	132	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	132	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	0	0	1	0	0	69	4.96	66/ 326	4.96	4.97	4.03	4.23	4.96	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	132	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	1	0	0	0	112	4.96	69/ 382	4.96	4.97	4.08	4.24	4.96	

Course-Section: BIOL 302 0101
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI
 Instructor: EISENMANN, DAVI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 237
 Questionnaires: 134

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 190
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 35	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 43
28-55	24	1.00-1.99 1	B 35		
56-83	19	2.00-2.99 11	C 27	General 2	Under-grad 134 Non-major 91
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 17	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 29	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0		
			Other 99		
			? 6		

Course-Section: BIOL 302 0101
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, PHIL (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 237
 Questionnaires: 134

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 191
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	4	20	43	64	4.23	988/1576	4.23	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	7	34	53	38	3.90	1237/1576	3.90	4.17	4.27	4.28	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	8	39	40	42	3.81	1105/1342	3.81	4.05	4.32	4.30	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	79	1	4	12	13	24	4.02	1036/1520	4.02	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.02	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	11	12	30	32	39	3.61	1201/1465	3.61	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	95	3	1	6	11	13	3.88	1015/1434	3.88	3.85	4.14	4.15	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	2	6	4	30	32	56	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	1	28	97	4.76	739/1574	4.76	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	33	1	5	8	35	35	17	3.51	1299/1554	3.83	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	6	1	20	25	80	4.30	1072/1488	4.47	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	3	13	22	92	4.51	1210/1493	4.61	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	7	17	27	45	34	3.63	1296/1486	3.99	4.19	4.32	4.32	3.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	8	14	22	28	58	3.88	1205/1489	4.12	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	7	7	18	33	60	4.06	672/1277	4.18	4.00	4.03	4.11	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	93	0	14	5	6	7	9	2.80	1224/1279	2.80	4.10	4.17	4.20	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	92	0	5	4	11	6	16	3.57	1121/1270	3.57	4.23	4.35	4.42	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	93	0	6	2	12	7	14	3.51	1113/1269	3.51	4.16	4.35	4.41	3.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	94	22	2	3	5	2	6	3.39	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.44	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.54	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	132	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 232	****	4.57	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	132	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.34	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	132	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	132	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	51	0	0	0	0	0	83	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	132	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	132	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	132	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	0	0	1	0	0	69	4.96	66/ 326	4.96	4.97	4.03	4.23	4.96	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	132	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	132	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	1	0	0	0	112	4.96	69/ 382	4.96	4.97	4.08	4.24	4.96	

Course-Section: BIOL 302 0101
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, PHIL (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 237
 Questionnaires: 134

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 191
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 35	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 43
28-55	24	1.00-1.99 1	B 35		
56-83	19	2.00-2.99 11	C 27	General 2	Under-grad 134 Non-major 91
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 17	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 29	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0		
			? 6	Other 99	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 192
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	976/1576	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	8	10	4.19	996/1576	4.19	4.17	4.27	4.28	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	3	11	4.00	972/1342	3.99	4.05	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	1	5	10	4.00	1041/1520	4.05	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	1	8	6	3.74	1116/1465	3.79	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	12	4	3.85	1033/1434	3.90	3.85	4.14	4.15	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	0	14	4.20	900/1547	4.08	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	1079/1574	4.72	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	805/1554	3.93	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	401/1488	4.63	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	1	18	4.75	908/1493	4.59	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	959/1486	4.25	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	4	12	4.32	910/1489	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	236/1277	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.11	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	780/1279	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.20	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	805/1270	4.21	4.23	4.35	4.42	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	793/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	631/ 878	3.75	3.79	4.05	4.09	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	110/ 234	4.29	4.44	4.23	4.24	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	91/ 240	4.42	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	107/ 229	4.58	4.54	4.51	4.48	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	85/ 232	4.55	4.57	4.29	4.16	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	0	3	12	4.56	69/ 379	4.25	4.34	4.20	4.17	4.56	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 375	4.96	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 326	4.99	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 382	4.95	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

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	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12								
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	10		
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0								
				I	0				Other	19			
				?	0								

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0202
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 193
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	1	1	6	4	4	3.56	1424/1576	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.30	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1207/1576	4.19	4.17	4.27	4.28	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	4	2	3	7	3.81	1105/1342	3.99	4.05	4.32	4.30	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	1	2	5	3	5	3.56	1342/1520	4.05	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	2	1	3	3	1	5	3.46	1262/1465	3.79	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	1245/1434	3.90	3.85	4.14	4.15	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	2	6	1	6	3.56	1320/1547	4.08	3.93	4.19	4.21	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	1202/1574	4.72	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	4	8	1	3.77	1159/1554	3.93	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	401/1488	4.63	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	1125/1493	4.59	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	1003/1486	4.25	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	4	3	0	8	3.80	1236/1489	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.34	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	2	1	2	1	6	3.67	943/1277	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.11	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1279	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1270	4.21	4.23	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	3.75	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	201/ 234	4.29	4.44	4.23	4.24	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	223/ 240	4.42	4.53	4.35	4.32	3.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	181/ 229	4.58	4.54	4.51	4.48	4.30	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	115/ 232	4.55	4.57	4.29	4.16	4.44	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	359/ 379	4.25	4.34	4.20	4.17	3.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	136/ 375	4.96	4.92	4.01	4.12	4.90	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	132/ 326	4.99	4.97	4.03	4.23	4.90	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	103/ 382	4.95	4.97	4.08	4.24	4.94	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0202
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 193
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0301
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 194
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	952/1576	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	279/1576	4.19	4.17	4.27	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	9	4.25	835/1342	3.99	4.05	4.32	4.30	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	441/1520	4.05	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	626/1465	3.79	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	878/1434	3.90	3.85	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	641/1547	4.08	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1574	4.72	4.74	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	732/1554	3.93	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	173/1488	4.63	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	908/1493	4.59	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	437/1486	4.25	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	552/1489	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	215/1277	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.11	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	665/1279	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.20	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	928/1270	4.21	4.23	4.35	4.42	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	819/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 878	3.75	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	70/ 234	4.29	4.44	4.23	4.24	4.54	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	103/ 240	4.42	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.46	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	83/ 229	4.58	4.54	4.51	4.48	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	111/ 232	4.55	4.57	4.29	4.16	4.46	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	88/ 379	4.25	4.34	4.20	4.17	4.46	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	141/ 375	4.96	4.92	4.01	4.12	4.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 326	4.99	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 382	4.95	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0301
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 194
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	1	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	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0302
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 195
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	2	9	4.06	1118/1576	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	1197/1576	4.19	4.17	4.27	4.28	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	972/1342	3.99	4.05	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	1012/1520	4.05	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	1145/1465	3.79	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	1	7	4	3.63	1162/1434	3.90	3.85	4.14	4.15	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1211/1547	4.08	3.93	4.19	4.21	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	972/1574	4.72	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	924/1554	3.93	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	1079/1488	4.63	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	1193/1493	4.59	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	1061/1486	4.25	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	1012/1489	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	3	0	2	0	8	3.77	882/1277	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.11	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1279	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1270	4.21	4.23	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 878	3.75	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	151/ 234	4.29	4.44	4.23	4.24	4.13	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	54/ 240	4.42	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	133/ 229	4.58	4.54	4.51	4.48	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	103/ 232	4.55	4.57	4.29	4.16	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	77/ 379	4.25	4.34	4.20	4.17	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.69	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 375	4.96	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 326	4.99	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	176/ 382	4.95	4.97	4.08	4.24	4.64	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0302
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 195
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	1	0	1	8	6	4.13	1073/1576	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	877/1576	4.19	4.17	4.27	4.28	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	951/1342	3.99	4.05	4.32	4.30	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	848/1520	4.05	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	803/1465	3.79	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	758/1434	3.90	3.85	4.14	4.15	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	5	9	4.25	838/1547	4.08	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	527/1574	4.72	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	7	3	3	3.69	1207/1554	3.93	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	547/1488	4.63	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	1125/1493	4.59	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1003/1486	4.25	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	2	9	4.13	1042/1489	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	2	3	5	3.62	968/1277	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.11	3.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1141/1279	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.20	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	784/1270	4.21	4.23	4.35	4.42	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1051/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.41	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	3.75	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	157/ 234	4.29	4.44	4.23	4.24	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	191/ 240	4.42	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.07	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	59/ 229	4.58	4.54	4.51	4.48	4.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	130/ 232	4.55	4.57	4.29	4.16	4.36	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	305/ 379	4.25	4.34	4.20	4.17	3.93	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 375	4.96	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 326	4.99	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 382	4.95	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0402
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 197
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	7	6	10	4.13	1065/1576	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	10	4.30	891/1576	4.19	4.17	4.27	4.28	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	9	8	3.87	1084/1342	3.99	4.05	4.32	4.30	3.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	7	10	4.09	1003/1520	4.05	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	7	5	6	3.57	1218/1465	3.79	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	6	7	8	3.95	941/1434	3.90	3.85	4.14	4.15	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	13	4.39	699/1547	4.08	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	702/1574	4.72	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	10	3	4.00	924/1554	3.93	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	568/1488	4.63	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	966/1493	4.59	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	911/1486	4.25	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	813/1489	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	5	3	10	3.86	829/1277	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.11	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	712/1279	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.20	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	928/1270	4.21	4.23	4.35	4.42	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	907/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	5	0	3	3.75	631/ 878	3.75	3.79	4.05	4.09	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	93/ 234	4.29	4.44	4.23	4.24	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	109/ 240	4.42	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	172/ 229	4.58	4.54	4.51	4.48	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	103/ 232	4.55	4.57	4.29	4.16	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	155/ 379	4.25	4.34	4.20	4.17	4.25	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 375	4.96	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 326	4.99	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 382	4.95	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

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	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0501
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 198
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	2	0	4	3	8	3.88	1257/1576	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.30	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	3	9	4.00	1138/1576	4.19	4.17	4.27	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	2	8	3.82	1101/1342	3.99	4.05	4.32	4.30	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	1012/1520	4.05	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	850/1465	3.79	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	7	4.00	878/1434	3.90	3.85	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	2	9	3.88	1159/1547	4.08	3.93	4.19	4.21	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	851/1574	4.72	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1201/1554	3.93	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	1126/1488	4.63	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	1311/1493	4.59	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	1	4	8	4.00	1101/1486	4.25	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	10	4.00	1118/1489	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	0	0	5	7	4.07	664/1277	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.11	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	554/1279	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.20	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	736/1270	4.21	4.23	4.35	4.42	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	584/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.41	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 878	3.75	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	50/ 234	4.29	4.44	4.23	4.24	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 240	4.42	4.53	4.35	4.32	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 229	4.58	4.54	4.51	4.48	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 232	4.55	4.57	4.29	4.16	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	128/ 379	4.25	4.34	4.20	4.17	4.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 375	4.96	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 326	4.99	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 382	4.95	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0502
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 199
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	7	6	5	3.89	1257/1576	4.02	4.27	4.30	4.30	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	9	5	4.06	1107/1576	4.19	4.17	4.27	4.28	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	931/1342	3.99	4.05	4.32	4.30	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1225/1520	4.05	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	4	5	3.50	1242/1465	3.79	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	826/1434	3.90	3.85	4.14	4.15	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	963/1547	4.08	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	508/1574	4.72	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1103/1554	3.93	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	870/1488	4.63	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	1263/1493	4.59	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1003/1486	4.25	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	1118/1489	4.18	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	668/1277	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.11	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1279	4.04	4.10	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1270	4.21	4.23	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1269	4.19	4.16	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 878	3.75	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	74/ 234	4.29	4.44	4.23	4.24	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	91/ 240	4.42	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	162/ 229	4.58	4.54	4.51	4.48	4.38	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	103/ 232	4.55	4.57	4.29	4.16	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	115/ 379	4.25	4.34	4.20	4.17	4.38	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 375	4.96	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 326	4.99	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 382	4.95	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 2		

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY
 Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 249
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 200
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	6	12	19	29	4.03	1136/1576	4.03	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	4	23	17	18	3.58	1372/1576	3.58	4.17	4.27	4.28	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	11	14	18	17	3.48	1221/1342	3.48	4.05	4.32	4.30	3.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	55	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	****/1520	****	4.06	4.25	4.25	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	13	10	12	12	14	3.07	1375/1465	3.07	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	59	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/1434	****	3.85	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	4	5	10	18	27	3.92	1124/1547	3.92	3.93	4.19	4.21	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	2	62	4.94	328/1574	4.94	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	6	4	25	17	2	3.09	1432/1554	3.31	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	7	20	34	4.28	1095/1488	4.36	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	2	3	15	43	4.46	1240/1493	4.41	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	5	18	19	17	3.63	1296/1486	3.79	4.19	4.32	4.32	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	8	13	15	25	3.75	1255/1489	3.79	4.17	4.32	4.34	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	6	13	13	25	3.90	807/1277	3.95	4.00	4.03	4.11	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	54	0	5	1	3	3	1	2.54	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.20	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	53	0	2	3	3	4	2	3.07	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	54	0	2	3	2	4	2	3.08	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	54	8	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.09	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	48	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	44
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	28	2.00-2.99	4	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	67	Non-major	23
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	15	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	57				
				?	7						

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, SUZA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 249
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 201
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	6	12	19	29	4.03	1136/1576	4.03	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	4	23	17	18	3.58	1372/1576	3.58	4.17	4.27	4.28	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	11	14	18	17	3.48	1221/1342	3.48	4.05	4.32	4.30	3.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	55	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	****/1520	****	4.06	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	13	10	12	12	14	3.07	1375/1465	3.07	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	59	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/1434	****	3.85	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	4	5	10	18	27	3.92	1124/1547	3.92	3.93	4.19	4.21	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	2	62	4.94	328/1574	4.94	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	1	5	17	24	5	3.52	1299/1554	3.31	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	2	4	20	34	4.43	957/1488	4.36	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	3	6	13	37	4.37	1306/1493	4.41	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	3	4	11	16	25	3.95	1158/1486	3.79	4.19	4.32	4.32	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	5	13	13	25	3.83	1222/1489	3.79	4.17	4.32	4.34	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	1	7	8	18	25	4.00	692/1277	3.95	4.00	4.03	4.11	3.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	54	0	5	1	3	3	1	2.54	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	53	0	2	3	3	4	2	3.07	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	54	0	2	3	2	4	2	3.08	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	54	8	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	48	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	44
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	28	2.00-2.99	4	C	11	General	0	Under-grad	67	Non-major	23
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	15	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	57				
				?	7						

Course-Section: BIOL 304L 0101
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY LAB
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN
 Enrollment: 92
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 202
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	1	5	12	36	4.54	595/1576	4.54	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	24	0	0	1	3	7	23	4.53	581/1576	4.53	4.17	4.27	4.28	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	25	0	2	0	1	10	20	4.39	717/1342	4.39	4.05	4.32	4.30	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	26	0	1	2	1	7	21	4.41	683/1520	4.41	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	29	2	0	0	6	6	15	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	5	7	17	4.41	511/1434	4.41	3.85	4.14	4.15	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	29	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	196/1547	4.79	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	30	1	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.74	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	18	29	4.58	331/1554	4.58	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	385/1488	4.81	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	784/1493	4.81	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	191/1486	4.88	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	364/1489	4.77	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	36	7	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	404/1277	4.40	4.00	4.03	4.11	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	52	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	52	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	52	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	52	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	49	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	****/ 234	****	4.44	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	49	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	49	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	****/ 229	****	4.54	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	49	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	****/ 232	****	4.57	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	****/ 379	****	4.34	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	42	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	42	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

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	30
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	58	Non-major	28
84-150	22	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	29				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 305 0101
 Title COMP. ANIMAL PHYSIOLOG
 Instructor: LIN, WEIHONG (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 207
 Questionnaires: 97

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 203
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	3	25	26	41	4.07	1106/1576	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	7	35	29	22	3.63	1360/1576	3.63	4.17	4.27	4.28	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	7	27	37	19	3.61	1181/1342	3.61	4.05	4.32	4.30	3.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	65	2	4	8	9	8	3.55	1349/1520	3.55	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	5	3	18	25	37	3.98	891/1465	3.98	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.98	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	76	2	2	5	4	4	3.35	****/1434	****	3.85	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	1	8	7	33	42	4.18	916/1547	4.18	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	1	0	0	10	81	4.85	586/1574	4.85	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	7	14	35	29	6	3.14	1420/1554	3.29	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	3	6	13	31	38	4.04	1221/1488	4.13	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	2	1	14	20	54	4.35	1311/1493	4.40	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	11	8	30	24	15	3.27	1384/1486	3.43	4.19	4.32	4.32	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	11	6	23	24	24	3.50	1313/1489	3.53	4.17	4.32	4.34	3.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	6	7	4	17	26	29	3.80	862/1277	3.76	4.00	4.03	4.11	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	80	0	3	2	3	3	6	3.41	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	81	0	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	83	0	1	3	2	4	4	3.50	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	82	11	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	61	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	0	0	0	0	0	42	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	0	57	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	84
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	41						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	9	C	12	General	1	Under-grad	97	Non-major	13
84-150	45	3.00-3.49	20	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	24	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	78				
				?	10						

Course-Section: BIOL 305 0101
 Title COMP. ANIMAL PHYSIOLOG
 Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 207
 Questionnaires: 97

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 204
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	3	25	26	41	4.07	1106/1576	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	7	35	29	22	3.63	1360/1576	3.63	4.17	4.27	4.28	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	7	27	37	19	3.61	1181/1342	3.61	4.05	4.32	4.30	3.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	65	2	4	8	9	8	3.55	1349/1520	3.55	4.06	4.25	4.25	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	5	3	18	25	37	3.98	891/1465	3.98	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.98	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	76	2	2	5	4	4	3.35	****/1434	****	3.85	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	1	8	7	33	42	4.18	916/1547	4.18	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	1	0	0	10	81	4.85	586/1574	4.85	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	3	6	33	41	5	3.44	1331/1554	3.29	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	2	12	33	33	4.21	1142/1488	4.13	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	1	0	10	21	49	4.44	1255/1493	4.40	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	5	6	21	32	15	3.58	1311/1486	3.43	4.19	4.32	4.32	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	1	5	7	23	27	17	3.56	1305/1489	3.53	4.17	4.32	4.34	3.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	6	6	6	14	22	24	3.72	909/1277	3.76	4.00	4.03	4.11	3.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	80	0	3	2	3	3	6	3.41	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	81	0	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	83	0	1	3	2	4	4	3.50	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	82	11	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	61	0	0	0	0	0	36	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	0	0	0	0	0	42	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	0	57	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	84
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	41						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	9	C	12	General	1	Under-grad	97	Non-major	13
84-150	45	3.00-3.49	20	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	24	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	78				
				?	10						

Course-Section: BIOL 305L 0101
 Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 98
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 205
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	4	13	40	4.48	667/1576	4.48	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	4	13	40	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.17	4.27	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	4	14	39	4.45	658/1342	4.45	4.05	4.32	4.30	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	7	16	35	4.40	683/1520	4.40	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	6	0	2	8	12	28	4.32	579/1465	4.32	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	3	3	3	12	12	23	3.92	978/1434	3.92	3.85	4.14	4.15	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	3	10	21	21	4.04	1020/1547	4.04	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	8	48	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	1	0	3	21	24	4.37	584/1554	4.37	3.90	4.10	4.09	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	3	8	41	4.68	652/1488	4.68	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	0	2	3	47	4.79	829/1493	4.79	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	3	11	38	4.62	530/1486	4.62	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	5	12	34	4.45	754/1489	4.45	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	1	0	10	11	30	4.33	472/1277	4.33	4.00	4.03	4.11	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	50	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	50	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	50	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	5	12	30	4.53	70/ 234	4.53	4.44	4.23	4.24	4.53	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	2	3	9	33	4.55	84/ 240	4.55	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.55	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	4	9	33	4.63	103/ 229	4.63	4.54	4.51	4.48	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	1	1	3	7	33	4.56	96/ 232	4.56	4.57	4.29	4.16	4.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	8	11	24	4.37	115/ 379	4.37	4.34	4.20	4.17	4.37	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Course-Section: BIOL 305L 0101
 Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 98
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 205
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	52
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	62	Non-major	10
84-150	25	3.00-3.49	15	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	53				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 397 0101
 Title ETHICS/INTEG SCIENT RE
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 206
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	891/1576	4.30	4.17	4.27	4.28	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	879/1342	4.20	4.05	4.32	4.30	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	788/1465	4.11	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1093/1434	3.75	3.85	4.14	4.15	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	217/1547	4.78	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.74	4.64	4.61	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1081/1554	3.88	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1125/1493	4.60	4.61	4.73	4.70	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	422/1486	4.70	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	110/1277	4.89	4.00	4.03	4.11	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 397W 0101
 Title SCIENTIFIC WRITING
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 207
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1576	4.50	4.27	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	201/1576	4.72	4.17	4.27	4.28	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520	4.72	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	366/1465	4.15	4.07	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	138/1434	4.62	3.85	4.14	4.15	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	755/1547	4.07	3.93	4.19	4.21	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.74	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1554	4.00	3.90	4.10	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	4.83	4.44	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.61	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	4.67	4.19	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	500/1489	4.50	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.10	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.23	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.16	4.35	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.92	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	4						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 397W 0102
 Title SCIENTIFIC WRITING
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 208
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1148/1576	4.50	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	476/1576	4.72	4.17	4.27	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.05	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1520	4.72	4.06	4.25	4.25	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1067/1465	4.15	4.07	4.12	4.09	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	524/1434	4.62	3.85	4.14	4.15	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1219/1547	4.07	3.93	4.19	4.21	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.74	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1448/1554	4.00	3.90	4.10	4.09	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	666/1488	4.83	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.61	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	891/1486	4.67	4.19	4.32	4.32	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	888/1489	4.50	4.17	4.32	4.34	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.00	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	5.00	4.10	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	5.00	4.23	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	5.00	4.16	4.35	4.41	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.09	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.92	4.01	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.24	5.00	

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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	3						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 420 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS:CELL BIOLOG
 Instructor: MCGRAW, PATRICI
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 209
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	3	6	7	4	3.17	1516/1576	3.17	4.27	4.30	4.46	3.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	5	1	6	7	4	3.17	1501/1576	3.17	4.17	4.27	4.35	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	2	3	9	5	3.50	1209/1342	3.50	4.05	4.32	4.46	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	2	5	4	6	2	3.05	1464/1520	3.05	4.06	4.25	4.38	3.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	4	9	5	3.43	1277/1465	3.43	4.07	4.12	4.22	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	3	2	6	4	1	2.88	1395/1434	2.88	3.85	4.14	4.30	2.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	5	2	5	6	4	3.09	1450/1547	3.09	3.93	4.19	4.24	3.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	3	16	2	3.82	1535/1574	3.82	4.74	4.64	4.69	3.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	5	2	5	7	2	2.95	1466/1554	2.95	3.90	4.10	4.24	2.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	2	4	9	3	3.33	1418/1488	3.33	4.44	4.47	4.55	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	1150/1493	4.57	4.61	4.73	4.80	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	1	5	7	5	3.48	1339/1486	3.48	4.19	4.32	4.41	3.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	4	2	9	5	3.62	1295/1489	3.62	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	4	2	10	3	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	4.00	4.03	4.04	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	3.97	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	3.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 428 0101
 Title COMPUTER APPL MOLEC BI
 Instructor: ONEILL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 210
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1516/1576	3.17	4.27	4.30	4.46	3.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1558/1576	2.67	4.17	4.27	4.35	2.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1329/1342	2.67	4.05	4.32	4.46	2.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	2.40	1514/1520	2.40	4.06	4.25	4.38	2.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1439/1465	2.67	4.07	4.12	4.22	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1204/1434	3.50	3.85	4.14	4.30	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1276/1547	3.67	3.93	4.19	4.24	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.74	4.64	4.69	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	3.90	4.10	4.24	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1452/1488	3.00	4.44	4.47	4.55	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1125/1493	4.60	4.61	4.73	4.80	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	0	0	1	2.60	1466/1486	2.60	4.19	4.32	4.41	2.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1392/1489	3.20	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.00	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	146/ 375	4.67	4.92	4.01	3.90	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/ 326	4.75	4.97	4.03	3.97	4.75	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/ 382	4.80	4.97	4.08	3.88	4.80	

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	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	1			

Course-Section: BIOL 430 0101
 Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: BUSTOS, MAURICI
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 211
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	13	13	4.19	1027/1576	4.19	4.27	4.30	4.46	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	17	8	4.03	1119/1576	4.03	4.17	4.27	4.35	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	13	13	4.22	865/1342	4.22	4.05	4.32	4.46	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	4	5	5	6	3.65	1305/1520	3.65	4.06	4.25	4.38	3.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	8	13	11	4.09	803/1465	4.09	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	1	8	5	7	3.61	1172/1434	3.61	3.85	4.14	4.30	3.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	16	12	4.26	838/1547	4.26	3.93	4.19	4.24	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	20	7	4.10	1427/1574	4.10	4.74	4.64	4.69	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	7	18	3	3.79	1138/1554	3.79	3.90	4.10	4.24	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	13	13	4.26	1111/1488	4.26	4.44	4.47	4.55	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	8	20	4.55	1176/1493	4.55	4.61	4.73	4.80	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	7	15	9	4.06	1081/1486	4.06	4.19	4.32	4.41	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	16	10	4.10	1070/1489	4.10	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	3	6	7	11	3.96	736/1277	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.04	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	962/1279	3.75	4.10	4.17	4.31	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	892/1270	4.13	4.23	4.35	4.53	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	894/1269	4.13	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	1	1	2	0	3	1	3.14	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.44	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	4.54	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.57	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.34	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	109/ 375	4.92	4.92	4.01	3.90	4.92	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	105/ 326	4.93	4.97	4.03	3.97	4.93	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	103/ 382	4.94	4.97	4.08	3.88	4.94	

Course-Section: BIOL 430 0101
 Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: BUSTOS, MAURICI
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 211
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	25
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	29	Non-major	7
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 434 0101
 Title MICROBIAL MOLEC GENETI
 Instructor: WOLF, RICHARD E
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 212
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	500/1576	4.60	4.27	4.30	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	350/1576	4.70	4.17	4.27	4.35	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	562/1342	4.53	4.05	4.32	4.46	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	937/1520	4.18	4.06	4.25	4.38	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	175/1465	4.80	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	2	4	1	3	3.08	1364/1434	3.08	3.85	4.14	4.30	3.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	624/1547	4.45	3.93	4.19	4.24	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	4.20	1367/1574	4.20	4.74	4.64	4.69	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	289/1554	4.63	3.90	4.10	4.24	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	324/1488	4.85	4.44	4.47	4.55	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.61	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	5	10	4.25	959/1486	4.25	4.19	4.32	4.41	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	5	2	4	3.67	943/1277	3.67	4.00	4.03	4.04	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	419/1279	4.55	4.10	4.17	4.31	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	260/1270	4.91	4.23	4.35	4.53	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	754/1269	4.36	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.44	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.54	4.51	4.70	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.64	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	3.97	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	3.88	5.00	

Course-Section: BIOL 434 0101
 Title MICROBIAL MOLEC GENETI
 Instructor: WOLF, RICHARD E
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 212
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 443 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS:DEVEL BIOLO
 Instructor: BREWSTER, RACHE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 213
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.27	4.30	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	811/1576	4.36	4.17	4.27	4.35	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.05	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	731/1520	4.36	4.06	4.25	4.38	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	159/1465	4.83	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	270/1434	4.67	3.85	4.14	4.30	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	1	5	3.83	1196/1547	3.83	3.93	4.19	4.24	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.74	4.64	4.69	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	395/1554	4.19	3.90	4.10	4.24	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	945/1488	4.50	4.44	4.47	4.55	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	557/1493	4.91	4.61	4.73	4.80	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	891/1486	4.39	4.19	4.32	4.41	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	997/1489	4.20	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	533/1277	4.25	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.10	4.17	4.31	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	288/1270	4.88	4.23	4.35	4.53	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	3.97	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	3.88	5.00	

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	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 443 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS:DEVEL BIOLO
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, D. (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 214
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.27	4.30	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	811/1576	4.36	4.17	4.27	4.35	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.05	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	731/1520	4.36	4.06	4.25	4.38	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	159/1465	4.83	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	270/1434	4.67	3.85	4.14	4.30	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	1	5	3.83	1196/1547	3.83	3.93	4.19	4.24	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.74	4.64	4.69	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	0	3.88	1081/1554	4.19	3.90	4.10	4.24	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	810/1488	4.50	4.44	4.47	4.55	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	557/1493	4.91	4.61	4.73	4.80	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	763/1486	4.39	4.19	4.32	4.41	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	997/1489	4.20	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	533/1277	4.25	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.10	4.17	4.31	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	288/1270	4.88	4.23	4.35	4.53	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	3.97	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	3.88	5.00	

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	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 454 0101
 Title VISION SCIENCE
 Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 215
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	0	13	4.56	554/1576	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	2	6	4	3.73	1318/1576	3.73	4.17	4.27	4.35	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	925/1342	4.13	4.05	4.32	4.46	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	476/1520	4.53	4.06	4.25	4.38	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	7	2	6	3.93	966/1434	3.93	3.85	4.14	4.30	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	999/1547	4.06	3.93	4.19	4.24	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.74	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	395/1554	4.50	3.90	4.10	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	547/1488	4.73	4.44	4.47	4.55	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493	4.86	4.61	4.73	4.80	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	951/1486	4.27	4.19	4.32	4.41	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	742/1489	4.43	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	5	1	8	4.21	569/1277	4.21	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.10	4.17	4.31	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	326/1270	4.83	4.23	4.35	4.53	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	773/1269	4.33	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	283/ 878	4.40	3.79	4.05	4.33	4.40	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	3.97	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	3.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 454 0101
 Title VISION SCIENCE
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 216
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	1	0	0	1	2	0	13	4.56	554/1576	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	2	6	4	3.73	1318/1576	3.73	4.17	4.27	4.35	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	925/1342	4.13	4.05	4.32	4.46	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	476/1520	4.53	4.06	4.25	4.38	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	7	2	6	3.93	966/1434	3.93	3.85	4.14	4.30	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	999/1547	4.06	3.93	4.19	4.24	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.74	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1554	4.50	3.90	4.10	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1488	4.73	4.44	4.47	4.55	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.86	4.61	4.73	4.80	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1486	4.27	4.19	4.32	4.41	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	813/1489	4.43	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	4.21	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.10	4.17	4.31	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	326/1270	4.83	4.23	4.35	4.53	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	773/1269	4.33	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	283/ 878	4.40	3.79	4.05	4.33	4.40	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	3.97	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	3.88	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	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 456 0101
 Title PLANT MOLECULAR BIOLOG
 Instructor: LU, HUA Miller, Stephen
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 217
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	0	1	18	4.95	98/1576	4.95	4.27	4.30	4.46	4.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	194/1576	4.84	4.17	4.27	4.35	4.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	381/1342	4.69	4.05	4.32	4.46	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	218/1520	4.79	4.06	4.25	4.38	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	13	4.56	360/1434	4.56	3.85	4.14	4.30	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	217/1547	4.78	3.93	4.19	4.24	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.74	4.64	4.69	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	93/1554	4.93	3.90	4.10	4.24	4.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	484/1488	4.76	4.44	4.47	4.55	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.61	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	261/1486	4.81	4.19	4.32	4.41	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	286/1489	4.82	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	347/1277	4.47	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.10	4.17	4.31	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.23	4.35	4.53	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	375/1269	4.82	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	252/ 878	4.45	3.79	4.05	4.33	4.45	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	3.97	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	3.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	2	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101
 Title SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS
 Instructor: KANN, MARICEL
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 218
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.27	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.80	4.17	4.27	4.35	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.05	4.32	4.46	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	921/1520	4.20	4.06	4.25	4.38	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.07	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	748/1434	4.20	3.85	4.14	4.30	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	690/1547	4.40	3.93	4.19	4.24	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1202/1574	4.40	4.74	4.64	4.69	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	3.90	4.10	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.44	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.61	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.19	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.17	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	4.10	4.17	4.31	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	4.23	4.35	4.53	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.16	4.35	4.55	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.79	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.44	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.53	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.54	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.57	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.34	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.88	4.72	4.77	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.69	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	59/ 72	4.00	4.25	4.64	4.64	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	66/ 80	4.25	4.36	4.61	4.52	4.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	164/ 375	4.40	4.92	4.01	3.90	4.40	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.97	4.03	3.97	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	3.88	5.00	

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101
 Title SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS
 Instructor: KANN, MARICEL
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 218
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 636L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 219
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	335/1576	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.43	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	811/1576	4.36	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	646/1342	4.45	4.05	4.32	4.38	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.06	4.25	4.36	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	718/1465	4.18	4.07	4.12	4.25	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	368/1434	4.55	3.85	4.14	4.35	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	608/1547	4.45	3.93	4.19	4.24	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.74	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	924/1554	4.33	3.90	4.10	4.18	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1018/1488	4.38	4.44	4.47	4.52	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1101/1493	4.63	4.61	4.73	4.80	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	959/1486	4.25	4.19	4.32	4.37	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	385/1277	4.43	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	554/1279	4.40	4.10	4.17	4.34	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	855/1270	4.20	4.23	4.35	4.53	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	852/1269	4.20	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.79	4.05	4.11	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	50/ 234	4.67	4.44	4.23	4.36	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	132/ 240	4.33	4.53	4.35	4.37	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	172/ 229	4.33	4.54	4.51	4.51	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	127/ 232	4.38	4.57	4.29	4.47	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	41/ 379	4.78	4.34	4.20	4.37	4.78	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.10	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.76	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.88	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 326	****	4.97	4.03	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.33	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Course-Section: BIOL 636L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 219
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 636L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 220
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	335/1576	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.43	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	811/1576	4.36	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	646/1342	4.45	4.05	4.32	4.38	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.06	4.25	4.36	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	718/1465	4.18	4.07	4.12	4.25	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	368/1434	4.55	3.85	4.14	4.35	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	608/1547	4.45	3.93	4.19	4.24	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.74	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.33	3.90	4.10	4.18	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	554/1279	4.40	4.10	4.17	4.34	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	855/1270	4.20	4.23	4.35	4.53	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	852/1269	4.20	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.79	4.05	4.11	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	50/ 234	4.67	4.44	4.23	4.36	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	132/ 240	4.33	4.53	4.35	4.37	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	172/ 229	4.33	4.54	4.51	4.51	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	127/ 232	4.38	4.57	4.29	4.47	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	41/ 379	4.78	4.34	4.20	4.37	4.78	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.65	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.25	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.36	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.10	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.00	4.40	4.76	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.88	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 326	****	4.97	4.03	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	4.60	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.33	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	7	
?	2			

Course-Section: BIOL 643 0101
 Title ADV TOP IN DEV BIOLOGY
 Instructor: BREWSTER, RACHE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 221
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.27	4.30	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.05	4.32	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.06	4.25	4.36	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.07	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.00	3.85	4.14	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1546/1547	1.00	3.93	4.19	4.24	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.74	4.64	4.75	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	3.50	3.90	4.10	4.18	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.00	4.44	4.47	4.52	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	4.25	4.61	4.73	4.80	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	4.25	4.19	4.32	4.37	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	3.75	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.10	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.23	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.79	4.05	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.10	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	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: BLUMBERG, D. (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 222
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.27	4.30	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.05	4.32	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.06	4.25	4.36	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.07	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.00	3.85	4.14	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1546/1547	1.00	3.93	4.19	4.24	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.74	4.64	4.75	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1537/1554	3.50	3.90	4.10	4.18	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1388/1488	4.00	4.44	4.47	4.52	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1473/1493	4.25	4.61	4.73	4.80	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1330/1486	4.25	4.19	4.32	4.37	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1466/1489	3.75	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.10	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.23	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.79	4.05	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.92	4.01	4.10	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 770 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN MOLEC BIOL
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, PHIL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 223
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor 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	3	4	8	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.27	4.30	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.17	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1342	****	4.05	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	805/1520	4.31	4.06	4.25	4.36	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	498/1465	4.42	4.07	4.12	4.25	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	524/1434	4.40	3.85	4.14	4.35	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	882/1547	4.21	3.93	4.19	4.24	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.74	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	623/1554	4.33	3.90	4.10	4.18	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1388/1488	3.50	4.44	4.47	4.52	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1411/1493	4.00	4.61	4.73	4.80	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1330/1486	3.50	4.19	4.32	4.37	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1381/1489	3.25	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1277	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	641/1279	4.29	4.10	4.17	4.34	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.23	4.35	4.53	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	882/1269	4.14	4.16	4.35	4.55	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	3.79	4.05	4.11	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	55/ 85	4.77	4.88	4.72	4.79	4.77	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	64/ 79	4.31	4.65	4.69	4.77	4.31	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	47/ 72	4.50	4.25	4.64	4.70	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	54/ 80	4.46	4.36	4.61	4.70	4.46	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	1	1	3	1	7	3.92	192/ 375	3.92	4.92	4.01	4.10	3.92	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.97	4.03	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.97	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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