**Course-Section: BIOL 123 01** 

**Title: Human Genetics** 

**Instructor:** Wagner, Cynthia

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 71

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	3	6	10	11	3.70	1414/1560	3.70	4.32	4.35	4.17	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	7	8	7	9	3.42	1473/1559	3.42	4.23	4.31	4.25	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	8	4	6	10	3.24	1334/1371	3.24	4.16	4.38	4.27	3.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	3	8	9	7	3.24	1473/1519	3.24	4.09	4.27	4.13	3.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	6	6	18	4.15	814/1452	4.15	4.17	4.18	4.04	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	10	3	3	9	3	4	3.09	1366/1430	3.09	3.99	4.16	3.98	3.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	4	5	8	12	3.61	1357/1539	3.61	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	31	4.91	454/1560	4.91	4.83	4.64	4.57	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	3	4	9	6	2	3.00	1484/1545	3.00	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	3	10	8	7	3.50	1437/1496	3.50	4.51	4.49	4.43	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	8	20	4.57	1191/1498	4.57	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	10	5	6	6	3.07	1451/1496	3.07	4.30	4.37	4.31	3.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	8	5	4	6	7	2.97	1454/1494	2.97	4.28	4.37	4.28	2.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	3	6	10	9	3.79	1024/1352	3.79	4.20	4.12	3.98	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	3	1	4	4	3	3.20	1170/1248	3.20	4.04	4.23	3.95	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1103/1250	3.71	4.28	4.39	4.13	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	971/1239	4.00	4.27	4.45	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	20	1	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	656/906	3.85	4.02	4.13	3.98	3.85

**Course-Section: BIOL 123 01** 

**Title: Human Genetics** 

**Instructor:** Wagner, Cynthia

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 71** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/206	****	4.47	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/214	****	4.52	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/207	****	4.51	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/199	****	4.47	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/26	****	****	3.89	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 123 01** 

**Title: Human Genetics** 

**Instructor:** Wagner, Cynthia

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 71

**Questionnaires: 34** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.38	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/10	****	****	3.94	5.00	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	20	Under-grad	34	Non-major	32
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	2				
				?	7						

**Course-Section: BIOL 141 01** 

Title: Foundations of Biology

**Instructor:** Sokolove, Philli

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 279

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	12	24	56	60	70	3.68	1417/1560	3.68	4.32	4.35	4.17	3.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	29	25	62	61	45	3.31	1489/1559	3.31	4.23	4.31	4.25	3.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	1	24	33	49	59	52	3.38	1316/1371	3.38	4.16	4.38	4.27	3.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	53	21	25	53	43	25	3.16	1484/1519	3.16	4.09	4.27	4.13	3.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	3	11	18	45	62	81	3.85	1095/1452	3.85	4.17	4.18	4.04	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	77	22	19	38	38	26	3.19	1351/1430	3.19	3.99	4.16	3.98	3.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	12	30	54	59	66	3.62	1352/1539	3.62	4.21	4.23	4.18	3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	2	0	1	0	18	196	4.90	454/1560	4.90	4.83	4.64	4.57	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	4	33	26	62	67	17	3.04	1479/1545	3.04	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	5	11	23	62	116	4.26	1144/1496	4.26	4.51	4.49	4.43	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	4	7	25	37	141	4.42	1302/1498	4.42	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	26	29	45	52	61	3.44	1401/1496	3.44	4.30	4.37	4.31	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	1	27	27	43	51	65	3.47	1393/1494	3.47	4.28	4.37	4.28	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	7	31	23	49	43	56	3.35	1221/1352	3.35	4.20	4.12	3.98	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	25	19	37	56	67	3.59	1044/1248	3.59	4.04	4.23	3.95	3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	12	12	27	58	94	4.03	937/1250	4.03	4.28	4.39	4.13	4.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	19	10	33	50	90	3.90	1045/1239	3.90	4.27	4.45	4.18	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	24	8	21	9	30	49	85	3.87	646/906	3.87	4.02	4.13	3.98	3.87

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 141 01** 

**Title: Foundations of Biology** 

**Instructor:** Sokolove, Philli

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 279

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	223	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/214	****	4.52	4.31	4.30	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	225	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	225	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	225	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	225	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	225	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	225	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	225	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.42	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 141 01** 

**Title: Foundations of Biology** 

**Instructor: Sokolove, Philli** 

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 279** 

**Questionnaires: 226** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	225	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.61	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	44	0.00-0.99	0	Α	49	Required for Majors	184	Graduate	0	Major	96
28-55	39	1.00-1.99	0	В	77						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	21	С	62	General	13	Under-grad	226	Non-major	130
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	44	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	40	F	1	Electives	4	**** - Means the	ere are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significan	t		
				1	0	Other	3				
				?	18						

**Course-Section: BIOL 142 01** 

Title: Foundations of Biology:

**Instructor: Omland, Kevin E** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 350

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	18	49	67	4.33	886/1560	4.33	4.32	4.35	4.17	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	18	47	66	4.30	902/1559	4.30	4.23	4.31	4.25	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	8	21	36	68	4.19	952/1371	4.19	4.16	4.38	4.27	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	47	1	6	14	29	36	4.08	1016/1519	4.08	4.09	4.27	4.13	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	12	14	6	37	29	34	3.53	1282/1452	3.53	4.17	4.18	4.04	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	44	4	9	14	36	26	3.80	1068/1430	3.80	3.99	4.16	3.98	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	5	26	34	68	4.24	867/1539	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	2	33	98	4.72	824/1560	4.72	4.83	4.64	4.57	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	2	4	4	22	64	20	3.81	1181/1545	3.92	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	10	21	102	4.66	643/1496	4.66	4.51	4.49	4.43	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	6	10	116	4.81	822/1498	4.76	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	17	32	80	4.36	877/1496	4.44	4.30	4.37	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	3	4	11	18	95	4.51	714/1494	4.46	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	3	6	16	26	77	4.31	568/1352	4.35	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	5	10	25	36	42	3.85	937/1248	3.85	4.04	4.23	3.95	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	3	15	29	70	4.39	717/1250	4.39	4.28	4.39	4.13	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	7	2	20	26	62	4.15	922/1239	4.15	4.27	4.45	4.18	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	21	11	4	4	25	26	46	4.01	519/906	4.01	4.02	4.13	3.98	4.01

**Course-Section: BIOL 142 01** 

**Title: Foundations of Biology:** 

**Instructor: Omland, Kevin E** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 350

Questionnaires: 137

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	132	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/206	****	4.47	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	133	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/214	****	4.52	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	133	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	133	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/207	****	4.51	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	133	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/199	****	4.47	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	136	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	136	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	136	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	22	0.00-0.99	1	Α	62	Required for Majors	110	Graduate	1	Major	63
28-55	23	1.00-1.99	0	В	51						
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	7	С	8	General	8	Under-grad	136	Non-major	74
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	27	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	41	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	ere are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant	:		
				1	0	Other	4				
				?	13						

**Course-Section: BIOL 142 01** 

Title: Foundations of Biology:

**Instructor: Mendelson, Tamra** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 350

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	18	49	67	4.33	886/1560	4.33	4.32	4.35	4.17	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	18	47	66	4.30	902/1559	4.30	4.23	4.31	4.25	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	8	21	36	68	4.19	952/1371	4.19	4.16	4.38	4.27	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	47	1	6	14	29	36	4.08	1016/1519	4.08	4.09	4.27	4.13	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	12	14	6	37	29	34	3.53	1282/1452	3.53	4.17	4.18	4.04	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	44	4	9	14	36	26	3.80	1068/1430	3.80	3.99	4.16	3.98	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	5	26	34	68	4.24	867/1539	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	2	33	98	4.72	824/1560	4.72	4.83	4.64	4.57	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	52	32	1	1	8	37	6	3.87	1131/1545	3.92	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	60	0	0	1	6	12	58	4.65	677/1496	4.66	4.51	4.49	4.43	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	62	0	0	1	6	10	58	4.67	1077/1498	4.76	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	62	0	0	2	6	22	45	4.47	752/1496	4.44	4.30	4.37	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	62	1	2	2	10	16	44	4.32	932/1494	4.46	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	63	6	2	3	7	18	38	4.28	609/1352	4.35	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	5	10	25	36	42	3.85	937/1248	3.85	4.04	4.23	3.95	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	3	15	29	70	4.39	717/1250	4.39	4.28	4.39	4.13	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	7	2	20	26	62	4.15	922/1239	4.15	4.27	4.45	4.18	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	21	11	4	4	25	26	46	4.01	519/906	4.01	4.02	4.13	3.98	4.01

**Course-Section: BIOL 142 01** 

Title: Foundations of Biology:

**Instructor: Mendelson, Tamra** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 350

**Questionnaires: 137** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	132	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/206	****	4.47	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	133	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/214	****	4.52	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	133	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	133	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/207	****	4.51	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	133	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/199	****	4.47	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	136	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	136	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	136	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	22	0.00-0.99	1	Α	62	Required for Majors	110	Graduate	1	Major	63
28-55	23	1.00-1.99	0	В	51						
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	7	С	8	General	8	Under-grad	136	Non-major	74
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	27	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	41	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	ere are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant	:		
				1	0	Other	4				
				?	13						

**Course-Section: BIOL 142 01** 

Title: Foundations of Biology:

**Instructor:** Leips, Jeffery W

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 350

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	18	49	67	4.33	886/1560	4.33	4.32	4.35	4.17	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	18	47	66	4.30	902/1559	4.30	4.23	4.31	4.25	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	8	21	36	68	4.19	952/1371	4.19	4.16	4.38	4.27	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	47	1	6	14	29	36	4.08	1016/1519	4.08	4.09	4.27	4.13	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	12	14	6	37	29	34	3.53	1282/1452	3.53	4.17	4.18	4.04	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	44	4	9	14	36	26	3.80	1068/1430	3.80	3.99	4.16	3.98	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	5	26	34	68	4.24	867/1539	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.18	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	2	33	98	4.72	824/1560	4.72	4.83	4.64	4.57	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	2	1	1	15	65	29	4.08	899/1545	3.92	4.01	4.14	4.07	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	2	8	16	95	4.66	660/1496	4.66	4.51	4.49	4.43	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	1	5	12	104	4.80	869/1498	4.76	4.70	4.75	4.67	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	4	7	32	79	4.50	713/1496	4.44	4.30	4.37	4.31	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	3	1	2	9	26	82	4.55	667/1494	4.46	4.28	4.37	4.28	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	3	3	2	7	31	74	4.46	401/1352	4.35	4.20	4.12	3.98	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	5	10	25	36	42	3.85	937/1248	3.85	4.04	4.23	3.95	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	3	15	29	70	4.39	717/1250	4.39	4.28	4.39	4.13	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	7	2	20	26	62	4.15	922/1239	4.15	4.27	4.45	4.18	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	21	11	4	4	25	26	46	4.01	519/906	4.01	4.02	4.13	3.98	4.01

**Course-Section: BIOL 142 01** 

**Title: Foundations of Biology:** 

**Instructor:** Leips, Jeffery W

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 350

**Questionnaires: 137** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	132	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/206	****	4.47	4.25	4.15	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	133	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/214	****	4.52	4.31	4.30	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	133	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.54	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	133	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/207	****	4.51	4.44	4.50	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	133	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/199	****	4.47	4.27	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	136	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.50	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	136	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	136	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.54	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	22	0.00-0.99	1	Α	62	Required for Majors	110	Graduate	1	Major	63
28-55	23	1.00-1.99	0	В	51						
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	7	С	8	General	8	Under-grad	136	Non-major	74
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	27	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	41	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	ere are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant	t		
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	13						

**Course-Section: BIOL 233 01** 

**Title: Nutrition And Health** 

**Instructor: Claassen, Lark A** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 29

				Fre	quend	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	4	5	3.71	1404/1560	3.71	4.32	4.35	4.37	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	3	3.64	1404/1559	3.64	4.23	4.31	4.33	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	2	3	3.21	1338/1371	3.21	4.16	4.38	4.40	3.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	1	4	3	3.07	1490/1519	3.07	4.09	4.27	4.29	3.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	670/1452	4.29	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	3	3	2	2.79	1405/1430	2.79	3.99	4.16	4.15	2.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	4	1	1	1	1.93	1536/1539	1.93	4.21	4.23	4.25	1.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	4	2	3	0	2.42	1525/1545	2.42	4.01	4.14	4.09	2.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	2	6	3.79	1380/1496	3.79	4.51	4.49	4.52	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	1433/1498	4.07	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.07
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	3	3	5	3.50	1378/1496	3.50	4.30	4.37	4.36	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	1	6	3.43	1402/1494	3.43	4.28	4.37	4.41	3.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	3	1	2	5	3.21	1252/1352	3.21	4.20	4.12	4.14	3.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1177/1248	3.14	4.04	4.23	4.25	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1170/1250	3.43	4.28	4.39	4.40	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1212/1239	3.14	4.27	4.45	4.45	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	426/906	4.20	4.02	4.13	4.19	4.20

**Course-Section: BIOL 233 01** 

**Title: Nutrition And Health** 

**Instructor: Claassen, Lark A** 

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 29** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/214	****	4.52	4.31	4.60	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/22	****	****	4.13	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.75	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: BIOL 233 01

**Title: Nutrition And Health** 

**Instructor: Claassen, Lark A** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 29

**Questionnaires: 14** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.75	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	Α	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

**Course-Section: BIOL 251 01** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiology I

**Instructor: Leupen, Sarah Ma** 

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 97** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	7	63	4.90	161/1560	4.90	4.32	4.35	4.37	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	68	4.97	36/1559	4.97	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.97
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	61	4.86	215/1371	4.86	4.16	4.38	4.40	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	8	0	0	3	10	46	4.73	284/1519	4.73	4.09	4.27	4.29	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	10	58	4.80	171/1452	4.80	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	2	10	39	4.73	211/1430	4.73	3.99	4.16	4.15	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	6	61	4.86	153/1539	4.86	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	67	4.99	91/1560	4.99	4.83	4.64	4.61	4.99
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	0	1	0	0	4	45	4.84	127/1545	4.84	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	64	4.97	91/1496	4.97	4.51	4.49	4.52	4.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	66	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	64	4.97	64/1496	4.97	4.30	4.37	4.36	4.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	61	4.92	153/1494	4.92	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	3	5	51	4.81	110/1352	4.81	4.20	4.12	4.14	4.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	54	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	55	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	55	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.19	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 251 01** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiology I

**Instructor:** Leupen, Sarah Ma

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 97
Questionnaires: 71

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	68	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/206	****	4.47	4.25	4.58	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	68	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/214	****	4.52	4.31	4.60	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	68	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.64	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	68	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/207	****	4.51	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	68	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/199	****	4.47	4.27	4.51	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	42	Required for Majors	37	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	2	Under-grad	71	Non-major	46
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	10				
				?	13						

**Course-Section: BIOL 251L 01** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiol Lab I

**Instructor: Leupen, Sarah Ma** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 26

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	528/1560	4.72	4.32	4.35	4.37	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	201/1559	4.87	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	368/1371	4.84	4.16	4.38	4.40	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	421/1519	4.76	4.09	4.27	4.29	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	291/1452	4.56	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	304/1430	4.63	3.99	4.16	4.15	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	420/1539	4.76	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	83/1545	4.85	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1496	4.97	4.51	4.49	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1496	4.91	4.30	4.37	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	532/1494	4.77	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	547/1352	4.62	4.20	4.12	4.14	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1248	5.00	4.04	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1239	5.00	4.27	4.45	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.19	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 251L 01** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiol Lab I

**Instructor: Leupen, Sarah Ma** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 26

Questionnaires: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	11/206	4.91	4.47	4.25	4.58	4.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	49/214	4.76	4.52	4.31	4.60	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	112/204	4.71	4.56	4.52	4.64	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	17/207	4.91	4.51	4.44	4.67	4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	7	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/199	4.94	4.47	4.27	4.51	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	7	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

**Course-Section: BIOL 251L 02** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiol Lab I

**Instructor:** Leupen, Sarah Ma

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 25** 

	0 0 0 0 0 4 19 4.83 253/156					structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	253/1560	4.72	4.32	4.35	4.37	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	108/1559	4.87	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	85/1371	4.84	4.16	4.38	4.40	4.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1519	4.76	4.09	4.27	4.29	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	469/1452	4.56	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	304/1430	4.63	3.99	4.16	4.15	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	102/1539	4.76	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	0	0	17	4.78	165/1545	4.85	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	159/1496	4.97	4.51	4.49	4.52	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	280/1496	4.91	4.30	4.37	4.36	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	233/1494	4.77	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	80/1352	4.62	4.20	4.12	4.14	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1248	5.00	4.04	4.23	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.27	4.45	4.45	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.19	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 251L 02** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiol Lab I

**Instructor: Leupen, Sarah Ma** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 23

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	15/206	4.91	4.47	4.25	4.58	4.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	24/214	4.76	4.52	4.31	4.60	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	27/204	4.71	4.56	4.52	4.64	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	26/207	4.91	4.51	4.44	4.67	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	10	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	20/199	4.94	4.47	4.27	4.51	4.88

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	11	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	5						

**Course-Section: BIOL 252 01** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiology II

Instructor: Fleischmann, Est

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 83** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	1	43	4.93	113/1560	4.93	4.32	4.35	4.37	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	12	30	4.58	534/1559	4.58	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	9	30	4.51	621/1371	4.51	4.16	4.38	4.40	4.51
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	30	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	435/1519	4.60	4.09	4.27	4.29	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	3	9	25	4.59	340/1452	4.59	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	36	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	****/1430	****	3.99	4.16	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	8	33	4.60	435/1539	4.60	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	5	39	4.89	502/1560	4.89	4.83	4.64	4.61	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	3	9	28	4.54	378/1545	4.54	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	40	4.89	262/1496	4.89	4.51	4.49	4.52	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	43	4.96	278/1498	4.96	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	8	33	4.68	476/1496	4.68	4.30	4.37	4.36	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	41	4.84	275/1494	4.84	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	1	2	6	8	18	4.14	735/1352	4.14	4.20	4.12	4.14	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	40	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.19	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 252 01** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiology II

**Instructor:** Fleischmann, Est

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 83

Questionnaires: 47

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/206	****	4.47	4.25	4.58	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/214	****	4.52	4.31	4.60	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.64	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.51	4.44	4.67	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	12	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	22						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	С	7	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	31
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	4				
				?	5						

**Course-Section: BIOL 252L 01** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiol Lab II

**Instructor:** Fleischmann, Est

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 15

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	566/1560	4.79	4.32	4.35	4.37	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	942/1559	4.50	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	887/1371	4.49	4.16	4.38	4.40	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	917/1519	4.55	4.09	4.27	4.29	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	782/1452	4.38	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1430	4.64	3.99	4.16	4.15	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	663/1539	4.66	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	4.95	4.83	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	876/1545	4.53	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	559/1496	4.87	4.51	4.49	4.52	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1087/1496	4.64	4.30	4.37	4.36	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	466/1494	4.90	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	547/1352	4.43	4.20	4.12	4.14	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.19	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 252L 01** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiol Lab II

**Instructor:** Fleischmann, Est

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 12

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	47/206	4.78	4.47	4.25	4.58	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	54/214	4.86	4.52	4.31	4.60	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	80/204	4.83	4.56	4.52	4.64	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	38/207	4.81	4.51	4.44	4.67	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	97/199	4.67	4.47	4.27	4.51	4.33

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

**Course-Section: BIOL 252L 02** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiol Lab II

Instructor: Fleischmann, Est

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 20

	_			Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	4.79	4.32	4.35	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	296/1559	4.50	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	261/1371	4.49	4.16	4.38	4.40	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1519	4.55	4.09	4.27	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	433/1452	4.38	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	427/1430	4.64	3.99	4.16	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	80/1539	4.66	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	4.95	4.83	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	83/1545	4.53	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1496	4.87	4.51	4.49	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	160/1496	4.64	4.30	4.37	4.36	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1494	4.90	4.28	4.37	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1352	4.43	4.20	4.12	4.14	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.19	****

**Course-Section: BIOL 252L 02** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiol Lab II

Instructor: Fleischmann, Est

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 20

Questionnaires: 16

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	32/206	4.78	4.47	4.25	4.58	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/214	4.86	4.52	4.31	4.60	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/204	4.83	4.56	4.52	4.64	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	38/207	4.81	4.51	4.44	4.67	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/199	4.67	4.47	4.27	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.41	5.00	****

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:27 PM

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 252L 02** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiol Lab II

**Instructor:** Fleischmann, Est

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 16

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.75	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	13
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

**Course-Section: BIOL 252L 03** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiol Lab II

Instructor: Fleischmann, Est

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	301/1560	4.79	4.32	4.35	4.37	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	627/1559	4.50	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	724/1371	4.49	4.16	4.38	4.40	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	635/1519	4.55	4.09	4.27	4.29	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	494/1452	4.38	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	323/1430	4.64	3.99	4.16	4.15	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	378/1539	4.66	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	574/1560	4.95	4.83	4.64	4.61	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	360/1545	4.53	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	262/1496	4.87	4.51	4.49	4.52	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	186/1496	4.64	4.30	4.37	4.36	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1494	4.90	4.28	4.37	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	735/1352	4.43	4.20	4.12	4.14	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.19	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 252L 03** 

Title: Anatomy & Physiol Lab II

**Instructor:** Fleischmann, Est

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 15

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	12/206	4.78	4.47	4.25	4.58	4.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	11/214	4.86	4.52	4.31	4.60	4.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	37/204	4.83	4.56	4.52	4.64	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	56/207	4.81	4.51	4.44	4.67	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/199	4.67	4.47	4.27	4.51	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	0	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	3				
				?	5						

**Course-Section: BIOL 275 01** 

Title: Microbiology

**Instructor: Gdovin,Susan L** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 207

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	3	18	32	65	4.32	908/1560	4.32	4.32	4.35	4.37	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	4	8	28	29	48	3.93	1231/1559	3.93	4.23	4.31	4.33	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	5	10	26	35	42	3.84	1187/1371	3.84	4.16	4.38	4.40	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	49	3	4	11	24	27	3.99	1083/1519	3.99	4.09	4.27	4.29	3.99
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	4	4	22	34	52	4.09	884/1452	4.09	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	70	3	4	11	6	24	3.92	995/1430	3.92	3.99	4.16	4.15	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	5	19	20	70	4.27	832/1539	4.27	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	47	69	4.59	970/1560	4.59	4.83	4.64	4.61	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	2	1	13	45	41	4.20	797/1545	3.69	4.01	4.14	4.09	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	3	16	97	4.79	437/1496	4.54	4.51	4.49	4.52	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	9	106	4.89	615/1498	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	4	10	24	78	4.49	726/1496	3.94	4.30	4.37	4.36	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	4	12	24	77	4.49	750/1494	4.06	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	3	5	20	21	58	4.18	707/1352	3.92	4.20	4.12	4.14	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	98	0	1	2	3	7	10	4.00	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	98	0	0	2	2	7	12	4.26	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	99	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	98	13	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.19	****

**Course-Section: BIOL 275 01** 

Title: Microbiology

**Instructor: Gdovin,Susan L** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 207

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	117	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/206	****	4.47	4.25	4.58	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	117	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/214	****	4.52	4.31	4.60	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	117	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.64	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	117	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/207	****	4.51	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	117	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/199	****	4.47	4.27	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	118	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	118	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	118	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	118	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	118	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	119	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	119	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	120	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	120	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	120	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	5.00	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: BIOL 275 01

Title: Microbiology

**Instructor: Gdovin,Susan L** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 207
Questionnaires: 121

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	120	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	5.00	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	Α	36	Required for Majors	81	Graduate	0	Major	57
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	46						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	2	С	17	General	2	Under-grad	121	Non-major	64
84-150	24	3.00-3.49	25	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	33	F	0	Electives	15	**** - Means the	ere are not e	nough responses	
				Р	1			to be significan	t		
				1	0	Other	8				
				?	16						

**Course-Section: BIOL 275 01** 

Title: Microbiology

**Instructor: Sandoz, James W** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 207

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	3	18	32	65	4.32	908/1560	4.32	4.32	4.35	4.37	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	4	8	28	29	48	3.93	1231/1559	3.93	4.23	4.31	4.33	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	5	10	26	35	42	3.84	1187/1371	3.84	4.16	4.38	4.40	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	49	3	4	11	24	27	3.99	1083/1519	3.99	4.09	4.27	4.29	3.99
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	4	4	22	34	52	4.09	884/1452	4.09	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	70	3	4	11	6	24	3.92	995/1430	3.92	3.99	4.16	4.15	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	5	19	20	70	4.27	832/1539	4.27	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	47	69	4.59	970/1560	4.59	4.83	4.64	4.61	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	5	13	46	28	7	3.19	1458/1545	3.69	4.01	4.14	4.09	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	5	16	23	61	4.30	1104/1496	4.54	4.51	4.49	4.52	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	1	3	8	20	74	4.54	1215/1498	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	9	16	29	31	22	3.38	1414/1496	3.94	4.30	4.37	4.36	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	9	13	18	33	32	3.63	1355/1494	4.06	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	9	9	9	26	14	39	3.67	1095/1352	3.92	4.20	4.12	4.14	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	98	0	1	2	3	7	10	4.00	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	98	0	0	2	2	7	12	4.26	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	99	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	98	13	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.19	****

**Course-Section: BIOL 275 01** 

Title: Microbiology

**Instructor: Sandoz, James W** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 207

	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material			0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/206	****	4.47	4.25	4.58	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information			0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/214	****	4.52	4.31	4.60	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	117	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.64	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	117	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/207	****	4.51	4.44	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	117	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/199	****	4.47	4.27	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	118	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	118	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	118	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	118	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	118	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	119	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	119	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	120	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	120	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.75	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	5.00	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 275 01** 

Title: Microbiology

**Instructor: Sandoz, James W** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 207

**Questionnaires: 121** 

		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	120	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	5.00	****

<b>Credits Earned</b>		Cum. GPA		<b>Expected Grades</b>		Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	0	Α	36	Required for Majors	81	Graduate	0	Major	57	
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	46							
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	2	С	17	General	2	Under-grad	121	Non-major	64	
84-150	24	3.00-3.49	25	D	3							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	33	F	0	Electives	15	**** - Means the	ere are not e	nough responses		
				Р	1			to be significan	t			
				1	0	Other	8					
				?	16							

**Course-Section: BIOL 275L 02** 

Title: Microbiology Laboratory

**Instructor: Gdovin,Susan L** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	301/1560	4.72	4.32	4.35	4.37	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	260/1559	4.59	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	354/1371	4.37	4.16	4.38	4.40	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	179/1519	4.39	4.09	4.27	4.29	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	320/1452	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	626/1430	4.09	3.99	4.16	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	263/1539	4.50	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	727/1560	4.87	4.83	4.64	4.61	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	612/1545	4.28	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	137/1496	4.80	4.51	4.49	4.52	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1498	4.91	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	96/1496	4.78	4.30	4.37	4.36	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	115/1494	4.57	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	161/1352	4.13	4.20	4.12	4.14	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1248	4.15	4.04	4.23	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	325/1250	4.49	4.28	4.39	4.40	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	388/1239	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.45	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/906	4.10	4.02	4.13	4.19	****

**Course-Section: BIOL 275L 02** 

**Title: Microbiology Laboratory** 

**Instructor: Gdovin, Susan L** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	32/206	4.54	4.47	4.25	4.58	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	18/214	4.75	4.52	4.31	4.60	4.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	29/204	4.79	4.56	4.52	4.64	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	15/207	4.63	4.51	4.44	4.67	4.94
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	21/199	4.61	4.47	4.27	4.51	4.87
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.35	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	5.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.75	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 275L 02** 

**Title: Microbiology Laboratory** 

**Instructor: Gdovin,Susan L** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

**Questionnaires: 19** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.75	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

**Course-Section: BIOL 275L 03** 

Title: Microbiology Laboratory

**Instructor: Gdovin, Susan L** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

'	_			Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	376/1560	4.72	4.32	4.35	4.37	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	561/1559	4.59	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	667/1371	4.37	4.16	4.38	4.40	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	635/1519	4.39	4.09	4.27	4.29	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	659/1452	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	983/1430	4.09	3.99	4.16	4.15	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	622/1539	4.50	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	272/1560	4.87	4.83	4.64	4.61	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	341/1545	4.28	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	454/1496	4.80	4.51	4.49	4.52	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	334/1498	4.91	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	340/1496	4.78	4.30	4.37	4.36	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	726/1494	4.57	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	1098/1352	4.13	4.20	4.12	4.14	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1034/1248	4.15	4.04	4.23	4.25	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	945/1250	4.49	4.28	4.39	4.40	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	971/1239	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.45	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	426/906	4.10	4.02	4.13	4.19	4.20

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 03

**Title: Microbiology Laboratory** 

**Instructor: Gdovin,Susan L** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 18

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	47/206	4.54	4.47	4.25	4.58	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	24/214	4.75	4.52	4.31	4.60	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	56/204	4.79	4.56	4.52	4.64	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	19/207	4.63	4.51	4.44	4.67	4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	48/199	4.61	4.47	4.27	4.51	4.67

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

**Course-Section: BIOL 275L 04** 

Title: Microbiology Laboratory

**Instructor: Gdovin, Susan L** 

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 23** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	301/1560	4.72	4.32	4.35	4.37	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	627/1559	4.59	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	5	3	4	3.69	1241/1371	4.37	4.16	4.38	4.40	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	1	7	3.86	1220/1519	4.39	4.09	4.27	4.29	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	727/1452	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1044/1430	4.09	3.99	4.16	4.15	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1035/1539	4.50	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	574/1560	4.87	4.83	4.64	4.61	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	1	1	6	3	3.75	1212/1545	4.28	4.01	4.14	4.09	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	577/1496	4.80	4.51	4.49	4.52	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	556/1498	4.91	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	588/1496	4.78	4.30	4.37	4.36	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	1106/1494	4.57	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	2	0	1	0	5	3.75	1051/1352	4.13	4.20	4.12	4.14	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	941/1248	4.15	4.04	4.23	4.25	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	479/1250	4.49	4.28	4.39	4.40	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	563/1239	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.45	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	519/906	4.10	4.02	4.13	4.19	4.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 04

**Title: Microbiology Laboratory** 

**Instructor: Gdovin,Susan L** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 14

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	131/206	4.54	4.47	4.25	4.58	4.10
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	58/214	4.75	4.52	4.31	4.60	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	23/204	4.79	4.56	4.52	4.64	4.91
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	185/207	4.63	4.51	4.44	4.67	3.91
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	119/199	4.61	4.47	4.27	4.51	4.18

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	1	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

**Course-Section: BIOL 275L 05** 

**Title: Microbiology Laboratory** 

**Instructor: Gdovin, Susan L** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	566/1560	4.72	4.32	4.35	4.37	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	627/1559	4.59	4.23	4.31	4.33	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	561/1371	4.37	4.16	4.38	4.40	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	2	12	4.41	678/1519	4.39	4.09	4.27	4.29	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	402/1452	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.22	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	691/1430	4.09	3.99	4.16	4.15	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	233/1539	4.50	4.21	4.23	4.25	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	502/1560	4.87	4.83	4.64	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	518/1545	4.28	4.01	4.14	4.09	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	437/1496	4.80	4.51	4.49	4.52	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	704/1498	4.91	4.70	4.75	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	324/1496	4.78	4.30	4.37	4.36	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	436/1494	4.57	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	515/1352	4.13	4.20	4.12	4.14	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1248	4.15	4.04	4.23	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1250	4.49	4.28	4.39	4.40	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1239	4.49	4.27	4.45	4.45	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/906	4.10	4.02	4.13	4.19	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 275L 05** 

**Title: Microbiology Laboratory** 

**Instructor: Gdovin,Susan L** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	tructor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	50/206	4.54	4.47	4.25	4.58	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	58/214	4.75	4.52	4.31	4.60	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	89/204	4.79	4.56	4.52	4.64	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	56/207	4.63	4.51	4.44	4.67	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	40/199	4.61	4.47	4.27	4.51	4.73

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	<b>A</b>	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 02** 

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 24** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	958/1560	3.97	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	701/1559	4.36	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	634/1371	4.32	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	621/1519	4.13	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	330/1452	4.29	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	727/1430	3.85	3.99	4.16	4.20	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	185/1539	4.52	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	1015/1560	4.75	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	639/1545	3.89	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	1	17	4.67	643/1496	4.55	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	704/1498	4.55	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	2	16	4.57	621/1496	4.36	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	1	16	4.43	825/1494	4.16	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	127/1352	4.33	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	656/1248	3.68	4.04	4.23	4.33	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	794/1250	3.86	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	747/1239	3.68	4.27	4.45	4.53	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/906	3.63	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 02** 

Title: Experimental Biology Lab

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean         Mean         Mean           4.47         4.25         4.22           4.52         4.31         4.33           4.56         4.52         4.57           4.41         4.42         4.17           ****         4.41         4.54           *****         4.09         4.19           *****         4.35         4.13		Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	38/206	4.35	4.47	4.25	4.22	4.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	39/214	4.58	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	141/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.42
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	77/207	4.43	4.51	4.44	4.42	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	16/199	4.44	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.92
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: BIOL 300L 02

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 24

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	Α	16	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 03** 

Title: Experimental Biology Lab

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 24** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	808/1560	3.97	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	561/1559	4.36	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	690/1371	4.32	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	9	7	4.05	1032/1519	4.13	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	638/1452	4.29	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	6	5	7	4.06	858/1430	3.85	3.99	4.16	4.20	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	581/1539	4.52	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	857/1560	4.75	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	12	0	3.86	1140/1545	3.89	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	912/1496	4.55	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	1050/1498	4.55	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	632/1496	4.36	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	993/1494	4.16	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	292/1352	4.33	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	746/1248	3.68	4.04	4.23	4.33	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1117/1250	3.86	4.28	4.39	4.47	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1164/1239	3.68	4.27	4.45	4.53	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	884/906	3.63	4.02	4.13	4.14	2.83

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 03** 

Title: Experimental Biology Lab

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 24** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	25/206	4.35	4.47	4.25	4.22	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	105/214	4.58	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	61/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	136/207	4.43	4.51	4.44	4.42	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	38/199	4.44	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 03** 

Title: Experimental Biology Lab

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 21

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	Α	12	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 04** 

Title: Experimental Biology Lab

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 23

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	9	4.32	908/1560	3.97	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.32
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	260/1559	4.36	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.79
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	667/1371	4.32	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.47
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	987/1519	4.13	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.13
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	412/1452	4.29	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.53
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	858/1430	3.85	3.99	4.16	4.20	4.06
Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	321/1539	4.52	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.68
How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	272/1560	4.75	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.95
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	952/1545	3.89	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	542/1496	4.55	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.72
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	1199/1498	4.55	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.56
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	779/1496	4.36	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.44
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	391/1494	4.16	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.76
Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	389/1352	4.33	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.47
Discussion														
Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1248	3.68	4.04	4.23	4.33	****
Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1250	3.86	4.28	4.39	4.47	****
Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1239	3.68	4.27	4.45	4.53	****
Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/906	3.63	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 04** 

Title: Experimental Biology Lab

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	82/206	4.35	4.47	4.25	4.22	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	24/214	4.58	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	102/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.58
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	122/207	4.43	4.51	4.44	4.42	4.42
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	2	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	157/199	4.44	4.47	4.27	4.17	3.90

#### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	12	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:29 PM

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 05** 

Title: Experimental Biology Lab

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

·	_			Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	1	8	12	4.41	808/1560	3.97	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	508/1559	4.36	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	783/1371	4.32	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	0	0	9	10	4.35	755/1519	4.13	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	320/1452	4.29	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	3	4	11	4.10	834/1430	3.85	3.99	4.16	4.20	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	193/1539	4.52	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	227/1560	4.75	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	1	11	5	4.11	876/1545	3.89	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	577/1496	4.55	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	1239/1498	4.55	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	448/1496	4.36	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	985/1494	4.16	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	0	1	2	14	4.56	309/1352	4.33	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1248	3.68	4.04	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1250	3.86	4.28	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1239	3.68	4.27	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	3.63	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 05** 

Title: Experimental Biology Lab

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 24

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	tructor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	59/206	4.35	4.47	4.25	4.22	4.53
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	30/214	4.58	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	43/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	61/207	4.43	4.51	4.44	4.42	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	12/199	4.44	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.93

#### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:29 PM

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 06** 

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

·				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	3	7	7	3.52	1467/1560	3.97	4.32	4.35	4.42	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	5	10	3.91	1252/1559	4.36	4.23	4.31	4.35	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	6	10	3.96	1109/1371	4.32	4.16	4.38	4.41	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	5	1	7	5	3.40	1444/1519	4.13	4.09	4.27	4.33	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	814/1452	4.29	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	7	1	5	5	3.44	1273/1430	3.85	3.99	4.16	4.20	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	5	13	4.17	944/1539	4.52	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	867/1560	4.75	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	5	8	1	3.22	1451/1545	3.89	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	1	16	4.43	981/1496	4.55	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	3	1	15	4.38	1328/1498	4.55	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	1087/1496	4.36	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	3	2	10	3.70	1331/1494	4.16	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	1	4	1	9	3.53	1149/1352	4.33	4.20	4.12	4.23	3.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1188/1248	3.68	4.04	4.23	4.33	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	945/1250	3.86	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	1211/1239	3.68	4.27	4.45	4.53	3.17
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/906	3.63	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 06** 

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 24** 

**Questionnaires: 23** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	5	1	2	2	1	8	3.93	166/206	4.35	4.47	4.25	4.22	3.93
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	5	1	12	4.26	134/214	4.58	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.26
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	4	2	12	4.32	159/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.32
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	1	2	5	9	3.95	181/207	4.43	4.51	4.44	4.42	3.95
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	109/199	4.44	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.26
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:29 PM

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 06** 

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 23

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	١.	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	9	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 07** 

Title: Experimental Biology Lab

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 23

·				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	4	8	4.06	1164/1560	3.97	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	922/1559	4.36	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	810/1371	4.32	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	804/1519	4.13	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	506/1452	4.29	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	889/1430	3.85	3.99	4.16	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	761/1539	4.52	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	1086/1560	4.75	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	612/1545	3.89	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	610/1496	4.55	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	1294/1498	4.55	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	3	10	4.31	934/1496	4.36	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	2	10	4.33	922/1494	4.16	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	473/1352	4.33	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1248	3.68	4.04	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1250	3.86	4.28	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1239	3.68	4.27	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/906	3.63	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 07** 

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 18

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	51/206	4.35	4.47	4.25	4.22	4.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	35/214	4.58	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	50/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	136/207	4.43	4.51	4.44	4.42	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	97/199	4.44	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.33

#### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:30 PM

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 08** 

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 24** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	4	11	4.00	1193/1560	3.97	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	671/1559	4.36	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	690/1371	4.32	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	817/1519	4.13	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	782/1452	4.29	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	2	3	5	6	3.47	1258/1430	3.85	3.99	4.16	4.20	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	321/1539	4.52	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	227/1560	4.75	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1327/1545	3.89	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	807/1496	4.55	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1118/1498	4.55	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	832/1496	4.36	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	7	11	4.30	953/1494	4.16	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	697/1352	4.33	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	2	2	0	3	3.25	1158/1248	3.68	4.04	4.23	4.33	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	4	0	3	3.50	1154/1250	3.86	4.28	4.39	4.47	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	4	0	3	3.63	1137/1239	3.68	4.27	4.45	4.53	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	296/906	3.63	4.02	4.13	4.14	4.43

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 08** 

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 24** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	18/206	4.35	4.47	4.25	4.22	4.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	21/214	4.58	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	66/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.71
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	17/207	4.43	4.51	4.44	4.42	4.93
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	29/199	4.44	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.79
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 08** 

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 22

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	12	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 09** 

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	8	11	4.17	1082/1560	3.97	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	467/1559	4.36	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	537/1371	4.32	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	395/1519	4.13	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	15	4.46	494/1452	4.29	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	6	11	4.14	803/1430	3.85	3.99	4.16	4.20	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	19	4.67	349/1539	4.52	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	227/1560	4.75	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	3	12	4	3.86	1140/1545	3.89	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	20	4.74	524/1496	4.55	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	6	14	4.39	1323/1498	4.55	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	632/1496	4.36	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	5	15	4.35	911/1494	4.16	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	389/1352	4.33	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1248	3.68	4.04	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1250	3.86	4.28	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1239	3.68	4.27	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/906	3.63	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 09** 

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 24

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	51/206	4.35	4.47	4.25	4.22	4.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	48/214	4.58	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	126/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.47
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	42/207	4.43	4.51	4.44	4.42	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	50/199	4.44	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.65

#### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	17	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:30 PM

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 10** 

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	3	4	6	3.32	1517/1560	3.97	4.32	4.35	4.42	3.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	10	5	3.84	1309/1559	4.36	4.23	4.31	4.35	3.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	9	7	4.11	1014/1371	4.32	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	0	8	6	3.94	1130/1519	4.13	4.09	4.27	4.33	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	7	7	4.00	948/1452	4.29	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	6	5	4	3.69	1142/1430	3.85	3.99	4.16	4.20	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	0	5	11	4.11	1018/1539	4.52	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	877/1560	4.75	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	6	9	3	3.74	1225/1545	3.89	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	1136/1496	4.55	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	1223/1498	4.55	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	3	6	8	3.95	1222/1496	4.36	4.30	4.37	4.43	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	2	4	8	3.78	1296/1494	4.16	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	515/1352	4.33	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/1248	3.68	4.04	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1250	3.86	4.28	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/1239	3.68	4.27	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/906	3.63	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 10** 

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	2	1	2	2	5	3.58	189/206	4.35	4.47	4.25	4.22	3.58
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	121/214	4.58	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	2	0	3	7	4.25	167/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	148/207	4.43	4.51	4.44	4.42	4.27
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	1	1	1	1	7	4.09	131/199	4.44	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.09

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	7	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 11** 

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 22

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	1	5	1	3.20	1531/1560	3.97	4.32	4.35	4.42	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	1087/1559	4.36	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	1066/1371	4.32	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	5	2	3.70	1326/1519	4.13	4.09	4.27	4.33	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	1271/1452	4.29	4.17	4.18	4.21	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	1	3	3.30	1332/1430	3.85	3.99	4.16	4.20	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	622/1539	4.52	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	961/1560	4.75	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1115/1545	3.89	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	1168/1496	4.55	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1199/1498	4.55	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1175/1496	4.36	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	0	3	3	3.44	1397/1494	4.16	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	823/1352	4.33	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	194/206	4.35	4.47	4.25	4.22	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	163/214	4.58	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.10
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	144/204	4.55	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	185/207	4.43	4.51	4.44	4.42	3.89

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 300L 11** 

**Title: Experimental Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Whitworth, Karen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 11

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	2	1	4	3	3.80	163/199	4.44	4.47	4.27	4.17	3.80

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

**Course-Section: BIOL 302 01** 

**Title: Molec & General Genetics** 

**Instructor: Bieberich, Charl** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 259

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	1	4	11	26	62	4.38	830/1560	4.38	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	4	7	22	33	37	3.89	1270/1559	3.89	4.23	4.31	4.35	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	7	13	20	29	35	3.69	1241/1371	3.69	4.16	4.38	4.41	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	40	5	4	10	24	20	3.79	1269/1519	3.79	4.09	4.27	4.33	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	1	3	0	15	31	51	4.27	681/1452	4.27	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	51	2	5	14	14	15	3.70	1131/1430	3.70	3.99	4.16	4.20	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	3	11	30	55	4.32	785/1539	4.32	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	1	7	92	4.91	408/1560	4.91	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	1	0	3	12	46	24	4.07	905/1545	3.86	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	7	36	57	4.48	912/1496	4.49	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	13	87	4.85	704/1498	4.77	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	4	14	36	48	4.25	990/1496	4.22	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	3	4	13	21	60	4.30	961/1494	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	20	5	5	8	26	35	4.03	813/1352	3.98	4.20	4.12	4.23	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	5	13	16	33	20	3.57	1052/1248	3.57	4.04	4.23	4.33	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	2	10	17	27	31	3.86	1040/1250	3.86	4.28	4.39	4.47	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	2	3	21	23	37	4.05	960/1239	4.05	4.27	4.45	4.53	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	23	22	5	7	12	18	23	3.72	710/906	3.72	4.02	4.13	4.14	3.72

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 302 01** 

**Title: Molec & General Genetics** 

**Instructor: Bieberich, Charl** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 259
Questionnaires: 110

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect		
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	109	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.60	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	109	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	109	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	109	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	109	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	108	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

<b>Credits Earned</b>		Cum. GPA		<b>Expected Grades</b>		Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	Α	23	Required for Majors	81	Graduate	0	Major	50	
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	В	47							
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	8	С	15	General	0	Under-grad	110	Non-major	60	
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	14	D	2							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	26	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	ere are not e	nough responses		
				Р	0			to be significant	t			
				1	0	Other	0					
				?	21							

**Course-Section: BIOL 302 01** 

**Title: Molec & General Genetics** 

**Instructor:** Smith, Tracy

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 259

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect		
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	1	4	11	26	62	4.38	830/1560	4.38	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	4	7	22	33	37	3.89	1270/1559	3.89	4.23	4.31	4.35	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	7	13	20	29	35	3.69	1241/1371	3.69	4.16	4.38	4.41	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	40	5	4	10	24	20	3.79	1269/1519	3.79	4.09	4.27	4.33	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	1	3	0	15	31	51	4.27	681/1452	4.27	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	51	2	5	14	14	15	3.70	1131/1430	3.70	3.99	4.16	4.20	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	2	3	11	30	55	4.32	785/1539	4.32	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	1	7	92	4.91	408/1560	4.91	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	1	2	31	38	9	3.64	1274/1545	3.86	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	1	6	29	52	4.50	871/1496	4.49	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	1	2	20	65	4.69	1036/1498	4.77	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	2	3	11	35	39	4.18	1061/1496	4.22	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	1	6	5	11	23	45	4.07	1122/1494	4.18	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	17	5	3	10	25	27	3.94	893/1352	3.98	4.20	4.12	4.23	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	5	13	16	33	20	3.57	1052/1248	3.57	4.04	4.23	4.33	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	2	10	17	27	31	3.86	1040/1250	3.86	4.28	4.39	4.47	3.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	2	3	21	23	37	4.05	960/1239	4.05	4.27	4.45	4.53	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	23	22	5	7	12	18	23	3.72	710/906	3.72	4.02	4.13	4.14	3.72

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 302 01** 

**Title: Molec & General Genetics** 

**Instructor:** Smith, Tracy

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 259
Questionnaires: 110

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	tructor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	109	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.60	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	109	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	109	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	109	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	109	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	109	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	108	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	Α	23	Required for Majors	81	Graduate	0	Major	50
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	В	47						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	8	С	15	General	0	Under-grad	110	Non-major	60
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	14	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	26	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	ere are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant	t		
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	21						

**Course-Section: BIOL 302L 02** 

Title: Mel & Gen Genetics Lab

**Instructor: Caruso, Steven M** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	707/1560	4.32	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	439/1559	4.44	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	667/1371	4.33	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	867/1519	4.17	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	900/1452	3.81	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	3	1	4	7	4.00	889/1430	3.95	3.99	4.16	4.20	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	0	3	11	4.24	878/1539	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	502/1560	4.93	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	518/1545	4.29	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	159/1496	4.69	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	615/1498	4.77	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	186/1496	4.60	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	391/1494	4.50	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	292/1352	4.26	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	565/1248	4.06	4.04	4.23	4.33	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	542/1250	3.90	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	388/1239	4.05	4.27	4.45	4.53	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/906	4.00	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 302L 02** 

Title: Mel & Gen Genetics Lab

**Instructor: Caruso, Steven M** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 18

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	43/206	4.38	4.47	4.25	4.22	4.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	65/214	4.45	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.59
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/204	4.69	4.56	4.52	4.57	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	54/207	4.52	4.51	4.44	4.42	4.76
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	2	0	2	13	4.53	66/199	4.56	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.53

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	Α	6	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

**Course-Section: BIOL 302L 03** 

Title: Mel & Gen Genetics Lab

**Instructor: Caruso, Steven M** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 22

	_			Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	864/1560	4.32	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	775/1559	4.44	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	838/1371	4.33	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	693/1519	4.17	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	8	6	5	3.75	1155/1452	3.81	4.17	4.18	4.21	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	9	7	4.15	787/1430	3.95	3.99	4.16	4.20	4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	7	8	4.05	1047/1539	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1560	4.93	4.83	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	1	6	8	4.12	876/1545	4.29	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	577/1496	4.69	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	937/1498	4.77	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	588/1496	4.60	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	667/1494	4.50	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	619/1352	4.26	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	716/1248	4.06	4.04	4.23	4.33	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	945/1250	3.90	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	765/1239	4.05	4.27	4.45	4.53	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	519/906	4.00	4.02	4.13	4.14	4.00

**Course-Section: BIOL 302L 03** 

Title: Mel & Gen Genetics Lab

**Instructor: Caruso, Steven M** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 22

**Questionnaires: 20** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	88/206	4.38	4.47	4.25	4.22	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	121/214	4.45	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	63/204	4.69	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.72
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	77/207	4.52	4.51	4.44	4.42	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	40/199	4.56	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.72
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:30 PM

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 302L 03** 

Title: Mel & Gen Genetics Lab

**Instructor: Caruso, Steven M** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 22

**Questionnaires: 20** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	Α	10	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 04

Title: Mel & Gen Genetics Lab

**Instructor: Caruso, Steven M** 

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 21** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	1047/1560	4.32	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	587/1559	4.44	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	513/1371	4.33	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	857/1519	4.17	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	4	1	6	3.69	1196/1452	3.81	4.17	4.18	4.21	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	3	0	8	3.71	1124/1430	3.95	3.99	4.16	4.20	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	13	4.67	349/1539	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	318/1560	4.93	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	546/1545	4.29	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	926/1496	4.69	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	1	13	4.67	1077/1498	4.77	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	911/1496	4.60	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	922/1494	4.50	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	735/1352	4.26	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	980/1248	4.06	4.04	4.23	4.33	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1199/1250	3.90	4.28	4.39	4.47	3.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1203/1239	4.05	4.27	4.45	4.53	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/906	4.00	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 302L 04** 

Title: Mel & Gen Genetics Lab

**Instructor: Caruso, Steven M** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 15

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	115/206	4.38	4.47	4.25	4.22	4.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	71/214	4.45	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.55
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	89/204	4.69	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	114/207	4.52	4.51	4.44	4.42	4.45
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	51/199	4.56	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.64

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	Α	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

**Course-Section: BIOL 302L 05** 

Title: Mel & Gen Genetics Lab

**Instructor: Caruso, Steven M** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 23

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	970/1560	4.32	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	1030/1559	4.44	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	6	7	3.95	1117/1371	4.33	4.16	4.38	4.41	3.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	2	7	6	3.78	1281/1519	4.17	4.09	4.27	4.33	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	6	6	3.74	1169/1452	3.81	4.17	4.18	4.21	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	971/1430	3.95	3.99	4.16	4.20	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	832/1539	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	478/1560	4.93	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	755/1545	4.29	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	643/1496	4.69	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	903/1498	4.77	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	610/1496	4.60	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	901/1494	4.50	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	793/1352	4.26	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	926/1248	4.06	4.04	4.23	4.33	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1090/1250	3.90	4.28	4.39	4.47	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1103/1239	4.05	4.27	4.45	4.53	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/906	4.00	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

18

18

18

18

0

0

0

0

0

1

1

0

0

0

1

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

1.00

1.00

1.00

2.00

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 05

Title: Mel & Gen Genetics Lab

**Instructor: Caruso, Steven M** 

1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material

3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

2. Was the instructor available for individual attention

4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned

3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned

**Seminar** 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance

**Questions** 

Laboratory

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 23 Ouestionnaires: 19** 

4.37

4.41

4.41

4.35

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

4.51

4.27

4.54

4.13

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

UMBC Level **Frequencies** Instructor Course Ora Sect Mean Mean Mean NR NA 3 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean 4.31 4.22 3 0 1 1 1 2 11 92/206 4.38 4.47 4.25 4.31 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 0 2 2 1 12 4.35 117/214 4.45 4.52 4.31 4.33 4.35 2 3 0 0 0 4.41 4.69 4.56 4.52 1 13 141/204 4.57 4.41 2 2 4.18 0 1 2 0 12 166/207 4.52 4.51 4.44 4.42 4.18 2 0 0 1 1 6 9 4.35 93/199 4.56 4.47 4.27 4.35 4.17 \*\*\*\*/64 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 18 0 0 3.00 0 1 0 0 4.44 4.60 \*\*\*\*/58 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*/52

\*\*\*\*/66

\*\*\*\*/31

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.58	****
Self Paced														

\*\*\*\*/22 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 0 0 0 0 1.00 4.13 4.87 18 \*\*\*\*/29 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.41 4.78 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*/14 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 18 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.03 5.00 \*\*\*\*

0

1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned

\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 05

Title: Mel & Gen Genetics Lab

**Instructor: Caruso, Steven M** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	4	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

Course-Section: BIOL 303 01

**Title: Cell Biology** 

**Instructor: Craig, Nessly C** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 276

**Ouestionnaires: 28** 

UMBC Level **Frequencies Instructor** Course Ora Sect **Questions** NA 3 5 Mean Mean Mean NR 1 2 Mean Rank Mean Mean General 4.32 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 8 10 4.17 1073/1560 4.17 4.35 4.42 4.17 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4 0 0 2 6 7 9 3.96 1210/1559 3.96 4.23 4.31 4.35 3.96 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 2 6 8 2 3.09 3.09 1346/1371 3.09 4.16 4.38 4.41 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 2 3 6 5 6 3 3.00 1494/1519 3.00 4.09 4.27 4.33 3.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 2 2 2 4 7 8 3.74 1169/1452 3.74 4.17 4.18 4.21 3.74 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 4 8 1244/1430 3.50 4 1 3.50 3.50 3.99 4.16 4.20 3 7 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 3 5 9 3.72 1 1296/1539 3.72 4.21 4.23 4.27 3.72 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 1 24 4.96 182/1560 4.96 4.83 4.64 4.66 4.96 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 1 2 11 4.22 777/1545 3.28 4.01 4.14 3.28 4.19 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 1 0 4 21 4.73 524/1496 4.52 4.51 4.49 4.54 4.52 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 20 3 0 4 4.72 4.27 4.70 4.79 1 988/1498 4.75 4.27 3 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 4 8 4.24 3.92 4.30 4.37 3.92 1 12 999/1496 4.43 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 2 9 13 4.32 932/1494 4.37 3.99 1 3.99 4.28 4.43 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 3 0 1 2 7 10 4.30 579/1352 4.17 4.20 4.12 4.23 4.17 **Discussion** 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 5 0 3 5 7 3.45 3.45 1099/1248 4.04 4.23 4.33 3.45 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 1 919/1250 4.28 4.39 4 4 11 4.10 4.10 4.47 4.10 13 4.05 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 2 3 0 2 4.05 957/1239 4.27 4.45 4.53 4.05

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: BIOL 303 01

Title: Cell Biology

Instructor: Craig,Nessly C

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 276

Questionnaires: 28

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	3	1	3	3	7	3.59	748/906	3.59	4.02	4.13	4.14	3.59

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	Α	6	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

**Course-Section: BIOL 303 01** 

Title: Cell Biology

**Instructor:** Rosenberg, Suzan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 276

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	1073/1560	4.17	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	2	6	7	9	3.96	1210/1559	3.96	4.23	4.31	4.35	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	2	6	8	2	5	3.09	1346/1371	3.09	4.16	4.38	4.41	3.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	3	6	5	6	3	3.00	1494/1519	3.00	4.09	4.27	4.33	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	2	4	7	8	3.74	1169/1452	3.74	4.17	4.18	4.21	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	6	2	1	4	8	3	3.50	1244/1430	3.50	3.99	4.16	4.20	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	1	5	7	9	3.72	1296/1539	3.72	4.21	4.23	4.27	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	182/1560	4.96	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	7	6	4	2	2	2.33	1530/1545	3.28	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	1104/1496	4.52	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	2	6	5	9	3.83	1471/1498	4.27	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	12	4	6	3.61	1356/1496	3.92	4.30	4.37	4.43	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	9	5	7	3.65	1346/1494	3.99	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	2	5	4	10	4.05	803/1352	4.17	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	0	3	5	7	3.45	1099/1248	3.45	4.04	4.23	4.33	3.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	4	1	4	11	4.10	919/1250	4.10	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	3	0	2	13	4.05	957/1239	4.05	4.27	4.45	4.53	4.05

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: BIOL 303 01

Title: Cell Biology

**Instructor:** Rosenberg, Suzan

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 276

**Questionnaires: 28** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	3	1	3	3	7	3.59	748/906	3.59	4.02	4.13	4.14	3.59

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	Α	6	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	С	4	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	7						

**Course-Section: BIOL 305 01** 

Title: Comp. Animal Physiology

**Instructor: Lohr, Bernard** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 141

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	3	9	20	20	4.04	1175/1560	4.04	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	5	12	18	15	3.70	1381/1559	3.70	4.23	4.31	4.35	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	4	5	13	18	12	3.56	1281/1371	3.56	4.16	4.38	4.41	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	34	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1344/1519	3.67	4.09	4.27	4.33	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	1	2	11	14	17	3.98	980/1452	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.21	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	35	2	1	3	6	5	3.65	1166/1430	3.65	3.99	4.16	4.20	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	3	17	29	4.38	701/1539	4.38	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	49	4.94	272/1560	4.94	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	3	1	0	6	29	8	3.98	996/1545	3.69	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	14	36	4.65	660/1496	4.46	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	15	34	4.60	1167/1498	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	17	30	4.46	752/1496	4.02	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	5	14	30	4.39	860/1494	4.13	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	8	18	21	4.23	659/1352	4.04	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	51	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	51	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.53	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 305 01** 

Title: Comp. Animal Physiology

**Instructor: Lohr, Bernard** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 141

**Questionnaires:** 55

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	51	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	14	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	36
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	23						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	С	4	General	1	Under-grad	55	Non-major	19
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	12						

**Course-Section: BIOL 305 01** 

Title: Comp. Animal Physiology

**Instructor:** Lin, Weihong

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 141

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	3	9	20	20	4.04	1175/1560	4.04	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	5	12	18	15	3.70	1381/1559	3.70	4.23	4.31	4.35	3.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	4	5	13	18	12	3.56	1281/1371	3.56	4.16	4.38	4.41	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	34	1	2	4	6	5	3.67	1344/1519	3.67	4.09	4.27	4.33	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	1	2	11	14	17	3.98	980/1452	3.98	4.17	4.18	4.21	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	35	2	1	3	6	5	3.65	1166/1430	3.65	3.99	4.16	4.20	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	3	17	29	4.38	701/1539	4.38	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	49	4.94	272/1560	4.94	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	1	4	18	17	3	3.40	1395/1545	3.69	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	8	17	23	4.27	1136/1496	4.46	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	13	35	4.69	1036/1498	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	7	14	13	13	3.57	1362/1496	4.02	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	5	5	13	21	3.88	1246/1494	4.13	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	1	4	10	16	14	3.84	986/1352	4.04	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	51	51 0		1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	51	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	51	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.53	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 305 01** 

**Title: Comp. Animal Physiology** 

**Instructor:** Lin, Weihong

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 141

**Questionnaires:** 55

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	51	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP.	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	14	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	36
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	23						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	С	4	General	1	Under-grad	55	Non-major	19
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	12						

**Course-Section: BIOL 312L 01** 

**Title: Modeling in the Life Sci** 

**Instructor:** Bustos, Mauricio

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 18** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1424/1560	3.67	4.32	4.35	4.42	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	1	0	2.88	1538/1559	2.88	4.23	4.31	4.35	2.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	0	2	3.22	1337/1371	3.22	4.16	4.38	4.41	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1220/1519	3.86	4.09	4.27	4.33	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1366/1452	3.25	4.17	4.18	4.21	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1320/1430	3.33	3.99	4.16	4.20	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	1511/1539	2.60	4.21	4.23	4.27	2.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	743/1560	4.78	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1451/1545	3.22	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1243/1496	4.11	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1199/1498	4.56	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	2	1	3.11	1447/1496	3.11	4.30	4.37	4.43	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1442/1494	3.11	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.11

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 312L 01** 

**Title: Modeling in the Life Sci** 

**Instructor:** Bustos, Mauricio

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 18

**Questionnaires:** 9

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1051/1352	3.75	4.20	4.12	4.23	3.75

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

**Course-Section: BIOL 313 01** 

**Title: Bioinformatics Intro** 

**Instructor:** Erill Sagales,I

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 35

	_			Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	864/1560	4.35	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	11	2	3.88	1278/1559	3.88	4.23	4.31	4.35	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	792/1371	4.35	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1060/1519	4.00	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	803/1452	4.17	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	778/1430	4.17	3.99	4.16	4.20	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	785/1539	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	318/1560	4.94	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	10	4	3.94	1040/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	967/1496	4.22	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	1191/1498	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	990/1496	4.13	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	880/1494	4.25	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	494/1352	4.32	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.53	****

### **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: BIOL 313 01

Title: Bioinformatics Intro

Instructor: Erill Sagales,I

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 35

Questionnaires: 18

**Frequencies** UMBC Level Sect **Instructor** Course Org Questions NR NA 3 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean **Discussion** 4. Were special techniques successful 15 3.00 \*\*\*\*/906 \*\*\*\* 4.02 4.13 \*\*\*\* 2 4.14 1 0 0 0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

**Course-Section: BIOL 313 01** 

**Title: Bioinformatics Intro** 

**Instructor: Kann, Maricel Ga** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 35

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	864/1560	4.35	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	11	2	3.88	1278/1559	3.88	4.23	4.31	4.35	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	792/1371	4.35	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1060/1519	4.00	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	803/1452	4.17	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	778/1430	4.17	3.99	4.16	4.20	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	785/1539	4.31	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	318/1560	4.94	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	8	1	3.63	1284/1545	3.78	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	1281/1496	4.22	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	971/1498	4.65	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	1175/1496	4.13	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	1084/1494	4.25	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	629/1352	4.32	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.53	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: BIOL 313 01

**Title: Bioinformatics Intro** 

**Instructor: Kann, Maricel Ga** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 35

**Questionnaires: 18** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

**Course-Section: BIOL 316L 01** 

**Title: Phage Genome Analysis** 

**Instructor: Caruso, Steven M** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 26

·				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	2	5	6	3.42	1492/1560	3.42	4.32	4.35	4.42	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	7	3	2	2.89	1537/1559	2.89	4.23	4.31	4.35	2.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	5	3	4	3.05	1347/1371	3.05	4.16	4.38	4.41	3.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	7	4	3	1	2.56	1511/1519	2.56	4.09	4.27	4.33	2.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	2	6	5	3.47	1302/1452	3.47	4.17	4.18	4.21	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	6	3	4	2	2.88	1398/1430	2.88	3.99	4.16	4.20	2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	10	4	2	2	1	1.95	1535/1539	1.95	4.21	4.23	4.27	1.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	598/1560	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	4	10	0	3.38	1403/1545	3.44	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	2	7	7	3.94	1317/1496	4.00	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	2	13	4.44	1286/1498	4.47	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	2	6	5	3.44	1397/1496	3.41	4.30	4.37	4.43	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	5	5	3	3.11	1442/1494	3.29	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	3	1	3	6	3	3.31	1230/1352	3.54	4.20	4.12	4.23	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	1228/1248	2.57	4.04	4.23	4.33	2.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1170/1250	3.43	4.28	4.39	4.47	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1212/1239	3.14	4.27	4.45	4.53	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	852/906	3.00	4.02	4.13	4.14	3.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 316L 01** 

**Title: Phage Genome Analysis** 

**Instructor: Caruso, Steven M** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 26

Questionnaires: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	tructor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	185/206	3.64	4.47	4.25	4.22	3.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	3	2	2	3	3.27	206/214	3.27	4.52	4.31	4.33	3.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	2	0	4	3	2	3.27	200/204	3.27	4.56	4.52	4.57	3.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	2	1	0	2	5	3.70	191/207	3.70	4.51	4.44	4.42	3.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	3	2	1	3	2	2.91	197/199	2.91	4.47	4.27	4.17	2.91

### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	5	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:31 PM

**Course-Section: BIOL 316L 01** 

**Title: Phage Genome Analysis** 

**Instructor:** Erill Sagales,I

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 26

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	2	5	6	3.42	1492/1560	3.42	4.32	4.35	4.42	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	7	3	2	2.89	1537/1559	2.89	4.23	4.31	4.35	2.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	5	3	4	3.05	1347/1371	3.05	4.16	4.38	4.41	3.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	7	4	3	1	2.56	1511/1519	2.56	4.09	4.27	4.33	2.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	2	6	5	3.47	1302/1452	3.47	4.17	4.18	4.21	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	6	3	4	2	2.88	1398/1430	2.88	3.99	4.16	4.20	2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	10	4	2	2	1	1.95	1535/1539	1.95	4.21	4.23	4.27	1.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	598/1560	4.84	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	10	0	3.50	1342/1545	3.44	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	1262/1496	4.00	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	1239/1498	4.47	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	5	2	5	3.38	1415/1496	3.41	4.30	4.37	4.43	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	2	5	3	4	3.47	1393/1494	3.29	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	2	2	6	3	3.77	1044/1352	3.54	4.20	4.12	4.23	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	1228/1248	2.57	4.04	4.23	4.33	2.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1170/1250	3.43	4.28	4.39	4.47	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1212/1239	3.14	4.27	4.45	4.53	3.14
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	852/906	3.00	4.02	4.13	4.14	3.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 316L 01** 

**Title: Phage Genome Analysis** 

**Instructor:** Erill Sagales,I

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 19

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	tructor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	185/206	3.64	4.47	4.25	4.22	3.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	3	2	2	3	3.27	206/214	3.27	4.52	4.31	4.33	3.27
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	2	0	4	3	2	3.27	200/204	3.27	4.56	4.52	4.57	3.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	2	1	0	2	5	3.70	191/207	3.70	4.51	4.44	4.42	3.70
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	3	2	1	3	2	2.91	197/199	2.91	4.47	4.27	4.17	2.91

### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	5	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	1
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:31 PM

**Course-Section: BIOL 340L 01** 

Title: Developmtl Biology Lab

**Instructor:** Wagner, Cynthia

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 23

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1193/1560	4.33	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1333/1559	4.00	4.23	4.31	4.35	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1313/1371	3.93	4.16	4.38	4.41	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	6	3	3.91	1177/1519	4.21	4.09	4.27	4.33	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	8	1	3.82	1114/1452	3.84	4.17	4.18	4.21	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	834/1430	4.04	3.99	4.16	4.20	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	725/1539	4.27	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	670/1560	4.85	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	846/1545	4.13	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1437/1496	3.77	4.51	4.49	4.54	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	1239/1498	4.69	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1351/1496	3.97	4.30	4.37	4.43	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1411/1494	3.92	4.28	4.37	4.43	3.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	823/1352	4.23	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

**Course-Section: BIOL 340L 01** 

Title: Developmtl Biology Lab

**Instructor:** Wagner, Cynthia

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 23** 

Questionnaires: 11

'				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	71/206	4.81	4.47	4.25	4.22	4.43
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	121/214	4.48	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	155/204	4.25	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	98/207	4.77	4.51	4.44	4.42	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	144/199	4.46	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.60	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.51	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.27	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	3.98	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	3.58	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	3.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.13	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.78	****

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:31 PM

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 340L 01** 

**Title: Developmtl Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Wagner, Cynthia

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 11

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	****	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

**Course-Section: BIOL 340L 02** 

Title: Developmtl Biology Lab

**Instructor:** Wagner, Cynthia

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 22

·	NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean           0         0         0         1         2         1         5         4.11         112           0         0         0         2         2         3         2         3.56         143           0         0         0         1         1         1         2         3.80         120           0         0         0         1         2         1         5         4.11         99           1         1         0         1         0         3         2         2         3.50         129           ed         2         0         0         1         3         1         2         3.57         120           2         0         0         1         1         2         3         4.00         107           2         0         0         0         0         1         6         4.86         57           ess         2         0         0         0         1         4         4.80         85           4         0         0         <				structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	1127/1560	4.33	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1435/1559	4.00	4.23	4.31	4.35	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1203/1371	3.93	4.16	4.38	4.41	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	996/1519	4.21	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1290/1452	3.84	4.17	4.18	4.21	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1206/1430	4.04	3.99	4.16	4.20	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1077/1539	4.27	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	574/1560	4.85	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	0	2	3.57	1309/1545	4.13	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1465/1496	3.77	4.51	4.49	4.54	3.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	852/1498	4.69	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1356/1496	3.97	4.30	4.37	4.43	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1147/1494	3.92	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	266/1352	4.23	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 340L 02** 

**Title: Developmtl Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Wagner, Cynthia

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 9

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/206	4.81	4.47	4.25	4.22	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	135/214	4.48	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	184/204	4.25	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	56/207	4.77	4.51	4.44	4.42	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/199	4.46	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.67

### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:31 PM

**Course-Section: BIOL 340L 03** 

Title: Developmtl Biology Lab

**Instructor:** Wagner, Cynthia

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 23** 

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			0	0	0	2	14	4.88	195/1560	4.33	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			0	0	0	6	10	4.63	467/1559	4.00	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals			0	0	0	5	7	4.58	537/1371	3.93	4.16	4.38	4.41	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	435/1519	4.21	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	782/1452	3.84	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	479/1430	4.04	3.99	4.16	4.20	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	635/1539	4.27	4.21	4.23	4.27	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	526/1560	4.85	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	255/1545	4.13	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	727/1496	3.77	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	920/1498	4.69	4.70	4.75	4.79	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	462/1496	3.97	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	870/1494	3.92	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	783/1352	4.23	4.20	4.12	4.23	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.33	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.47	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.53	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.14	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 340L 03** 

**Title: Developmtl Biology Lab** 

**Instructor:** Wagner, Cynthia

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 16

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/206	4.81	4.47	4.25	4.22	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	21/214	4.48	4.52	4.31	4.33	4.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	139/204	4.25	4.56	4.52	4.57	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/207	4.77	4.51	4.44	4.42	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	42/199	4.46	4.47	4.27	4.17	4.71

### **Frequency Distribution**

<b>Credits Earned</b>		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	11	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses		
				Р	0			to be significant				
				I	0	Other	1					
				?	5							

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:31 PM

**Course-Section: BIOL 395 01** 

Title: MARC U\*STAR Writ in Scie

Instructor: Farabaugh, Robin

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 6

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	276/1560	4.80	4.32	4.35	4.42	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	495/1559	4.60	4.23	4.31	4.35	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1371	****	4.16	4.38	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1519	4.50	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	948/1452	4.00	4.17	4.18	4.21	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1430	4.60	3.99	4.16	4.20	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1539	****	4.21	4.23	4.27	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1170/1560	4.40	4.83	4.64	4.66	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	952/1545	4.00	4.01	4.14	4.19	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1184/1496	4.20	4.51	4.49	4.54	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	371/1496	4.75	4.30	4.37	4.43	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1494	4.80	4.28	4.37	4.43	4.80

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 395 01** 

Title: MARC U\*STAR Writ in Scie

Instructor: Farabaugh, Robin

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 6

**Questionnaires:** 5

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	****	4.20	4.12	4.23	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	0	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	4			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

**Course-Section: BIOL 397 01** 

Title: Ethics/Integ Scient Res

**Instructor:** Claassen, Lark A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 23

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	1	2	4	1	1	2.89	1543/1560	2.89	4.32	4.35	4.42	2.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1413/1559	3.63	4.23	4.31	4.35	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1371	****	4.16	4.38	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	1	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1220/1519	3.86	4.09	4.27	4.33	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	3	3	2	0	2.88	1420/1452	2.88	4.17	4.18	4.21	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	4	2	0	1	2.71	1408/1430	2.71	3.99	4.16	4.20	2.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	3	1	1	3	0	2.50	1515/1539	2.50	4.21	4.23	4.27	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.64	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	3	4	0	3.22	1451/1545	3.22	4.01	4.14	4.19	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1416/1496	3.63	4.51	4.49	4.54	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	2	4	1	2	3.33	1492/1498	3.33	4.70	4.75	4.79	3.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	1446/1496	3.13	4.30	4.37	4.43	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	4	1	1	2	2.89	1465/1494	2.89	4.28	4.37	4.43	2.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	1	3	0	1	1	2.67	1318/1352	2.67	4.20	4.12	4.23	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	679/1248	4.25	4.04	4.23	4.33	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1250	5.00	4.28	4.39	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.27	4.45	4.53	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 397 01** 

**Title: Ethics/Integ Scient Res** 

**Instructor:** Claassen, Lark A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 14

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	239/906	4.50	4.02	4.13	4.14	4.50

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	1	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	9			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

**Course-Section: BIOL 414 01** 

Title: Eukaryotics Gen/Mol Biol

**Instructor:** Lindahl, Lasse A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 39

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	958/1560	4.28	4.32	4.35	4.45	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	4	3.89	1278/1559	3.89	4.23	4.31	4.34	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	4	7	3.83	1187/1371	3.83	4.16	4.38	4.46	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	6	4	3.50	1411/1519	3.50	4.09	4.27	4.33	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	793/1452	4.18	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	6	3	5	3.59	1200/1430	3.59	3.99	4.16	4.25	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	5	5	3.53	1381/1539	3.53	4.21	4.23	4.21	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1086/1560	4.47	4.83	4.64	4.68	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	10	4	4.06	912/1545	4.06	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	1168/1496	4.22	4.51	4.49	4.50	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	763/1498	4.83	4.70	4.75	4.77	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1149/1496	4.06	4.30	4.37	4.40	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	870/1494	4.39	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	579/1352	4.31	4.20	4.12	4.16	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/1248	****	4.04	4.23	4.39	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1250	****	4.28	4.39	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1239	****	4.27	4.45	4.61	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 414 01** 

Title: Eukaryotics Gen/Mol Biol

**Instructor:** Lindahl, Lasse A

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 39

**Questionnaires: 18** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.28	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	1	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

**Course-Section: BIOL 420 01** 

Title: Adv Topics:Cell Biology

**Instructor:** Miller, Stephen

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 33** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	22	4.83	241/1560	4.61	4.32	4.35	4.45	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	412/1559	4.58	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	2	17	4.59	525/1371	4.46	4.16	4.38	4.46	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	408/1519	4.62	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	22	4.83	149/1452	4.71	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	228/1430	4.63	3.99	4.16	4.25	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	18	4.58	456/1539	4.54	4.21	4.23	4.21	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	408/1560	4.83	4.83	4.64	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	131/1545	4.60	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	756/1496	4.70	4.51	4.49	4.50	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	278/1498	4.83	4.70	4.75	4.77	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	599/1496	4.62	4.30	4.37	4.40	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	0	19	4.73	451/1494	4.72	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	198/1352	4.58	4.20	4.12	4.16	4.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	253/1248	4.75	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	245/1250	4.74	4.28	4.39	4.55	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1239	4.83	4.27	4.45	4.61	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	119/906	4.78	4.02	4.13	4.28	4.78

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 420 01** 

**Title: Adv Topics:Cell Biology** 

**Instructor:** Miller, Stephen

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 33

Questionnaires: 24

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.18	****

#### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	11	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	1	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:32 PM

**Course-Section: BIOL 420 02** 

Title: Adv Topics:Cell Biology

**Instructor:** Brewster, Rachel

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 39** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	21	4.50	664/1560	4.61	4.32	4.35	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	21	4.53	587/1559	4.58	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	17	4.40	747/1371	4.46	4.16	4.38	4.46	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	22	4.62	408/1519	4.62	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	23	4.66	282/1452	4.71	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	21	4.59	343/1430	4.63	3.99	4.16	4.25	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	19	4.52	529/1539	4.54	4.21	4.23	4.21	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	711/1560	4.83	4.83	4.64	4.68	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	546/1545	4.60	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	23	4.69	610/1496	4.70	4.51	4.49	4.50	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	1050/1498	4.83	4.70	4.75	4.77	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	5	20	4.52	688/1496	4.62	4.30	4.37	4.40	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	506/1494	4.72	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	7	17	4.43	449/1352	4.58	4.20	4.12	4.16	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	288/1248	4.75	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	479/1250	4.74	4.28	4.39	4.55	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	388/1239	4.83	4.27	4.45	4.61	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	116/906	4.78	4.02	4.13	4.28	4.79

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 420 02** 

**Title: Adv Topics:Cell Biology** 

**Instructor:** Brewster, Rachel

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 39

Questionnaires: 30

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.40	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.18	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	2	Major	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	7
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

**Course-Section: BIOL 420 02** 

Title: Adv Topics:Cell Biology

**Instructor:** Starz-Gaiano, Mi

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 39

								structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	4	21	4.50	664/1560	4.61	4.32	4.35	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	21	4.53	587/1559	4.58	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	17	4.40	747/1371	4.46	4.16	4.38	4.46	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	22	4.62	408/1519	4.62	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	23	4.66	282/1452	4.71	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.66
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	21	4.59	343/1430	4.63	3.99	4.16	4.25	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	19	4.52	529/1539	4.54	4.21	4.23	4.21	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	711/1560	4.83	4.83	4.64	4.68	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	341/1545	4.60	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	349/1496	4.70	4.51	4.49	4.50	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	763/1498	4.83	4.70	4.75	4.77	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	371/1496	4.62	4.30	4.37	4.40	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	406/1494	4.72	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	249/1352	4.58	4.20	4.12	4.16	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	288/1248	4.75	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	479/1250	4.74	4.28	4.39	4.55	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	388/1239	4.83	4.27	4.45	4.61	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	116/906	4.78	4.02	4.13	4.28	4.79

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 420 02** 

Title: Adv Topics:Cell Biology

**Instructor:** Starz-Gaiano, Mi

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 39

Questionnaires: 30

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.40	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.18	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	2	Major	23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	7
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	1				
				?	8						

Course-Section: BIOL 430 01

Title: Biological Chemistry

**Instructor:** Gluick, Thomas C

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 102

**Ouestionnaires: 21** 

UMBC Level **Frequencies** Instructor Course Ora Sect **Questions** NA 3 5 NR 1 2 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 3 3 3 11 3.95 1235/1560 3.95 4.32 4.35 4.45 3.95 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 2 3 3 5 8 3.67 1395/1559 3.67 4.23 4.31 4.34 3.67 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 3 6 5 3.70 3.70 3.70 1 0 6 1239/1371 4.16 4.38 4.46 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 11 1 1 5 0 3 3.30 1463/1519 3.30 4.09 4.27 4.33 3.30 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 5 2 9 3.94 1012/1452 3.94 4.17 4.18 4.25 3.94 1 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 \*\*\*\*/1430 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 15 0 1 0 1 3.00 3.99 4.16 4.25 1018/1539 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 1 4.11 11 4.11 4.21 4.23 4.21 4.11 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 11 8 4.35 1212/1560 4.35 4.83 4.64 4.68 4.35 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 2 0 2 3 5 2 3.11 1472/1545 3.11 4.01 4.14 4.21 3.11 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 3 2 4 10 4.11 1250/1496 4.11 4.51 4.49 4.50 4.11 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 4 2 4.32 4.32 4.70 4.75 4.32 1 12 1364/1498 4.77 2 5 1430/1496 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 2 3.26 3.26 4.30 4.37 3.26 4.40 2 5 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 2 3 0 9 3.32 1419/1494 4.37 3.32 3.32 4.28 4.41 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 4 2 1 3 2 7 3.73 1064/1352 3.73 4.20 4.12 3.73 4.16 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned \*\*\*\*/1248 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 0 2 16 0 1 0 2 4.00 4.04 4.23 4.39 \*\*\*\*/1250 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0 0 0 1 2 4.20 4.28 4.39 4.55 \*\*\*\*/1239 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 \*\*\*\* 4.27 4.45 4.61 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*/906 4. Were special techniques successful 16 1 1 1 1 0 2.50 \*\*\*\* 4.02 4.13 \*\*\*\* 1 4.28

**Course-Section: BIOL 430 01** 

**Title: Biological Chemistry** 

**Instructor:** Gluick, Thomas C

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 102
Questionnaires: 21

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.40	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.40	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: BIOL 430 01

**Title: Biological Chemistry** 

**Instructor:** Gluick, Thomas C

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 102

**Questionnaires: 21** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						

**Course-Section: BIOL 434 01** 

**Title: Microbial Molec Genetics** 

**Instructor:** Wolf JR, Richard

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 29

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	458/1560	4.67	4.32	4.35	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	715/1559	4.44	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	442/1371	4.67	4.16	4.38	4.46	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	730/1519	4.38	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	221/1452	4.72	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1430	****	3.99	4.16	4.25	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	349/1539	4.67	4.21	4.23	4.21	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.64	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	314/1545	4.60	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	454/1496	4.78	4.51	4.49	4.50	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	615/1498	4.89	4.70	4.75	4.77	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	574/1496	4.61	4.30	4.37	4.40	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	451/1494	4.72	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	1	2	1	8	4.08	788/1352	4.08	4.20	4.12	4.16	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	618/1248	4.33	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	616/1250	4.50	4.28	4.39	4.55	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	677/1239	4.50	4.27	4.45	4.61	4.50

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 434 01** 

**Title: Microbial Molec Genetics** 

**Instructor:** Wolf JR, Richard

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 18

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.28	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	3	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

**Course-Section: BIOL 443 01** 

Title: Adv Topics:Devel Biology

**Instructor:** Blumberg, Daphne

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 21

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	264/1560	4.81	4.32	4.35	4.45	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	384/1559	4.69	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	937/1371	4.20	4.16	4.38	4.46	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	13	4.50	549/1519	4.50	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	68/1452	4.94	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	364/1430	4.56	3.99	4.16	4.25	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	1041/1539	4.06	4.21	4.23	4.21	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	940/1560	4.63	4.83	4.64	4.68	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	93/1545	4.92	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	0	1	8	4.27	1128/1496	4.27	4.51	4.49	4.50	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	733/1498	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.77	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	546/1496	4.64	4.30	4.37	4.40	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	788/1494	4.45	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	659/1352	4.22	4.20	4.12	4.16	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	155/1248	4.90	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	225/1250	4.90	4.28	4.39	4.55	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	388/1239	4.80	4.27	4.45	4.61	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	741/906	3.60	4.02	4.13	4.28	3.60

**Course-Section: BIOL 443 01** 

Title: Adv Topics:Devel Biology

**Instructor:** Blumberg, Daphne

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 21** 

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/206	****	4.47	4.25	4.48	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/214	****	4.52	4.31	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/204	****	4.56	4.52	4.39	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/207	****	4.51	4.44	4.49	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/199	****	4.47	4.27	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.19	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/29	****	****	4.11	4.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.25	4.40	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/26	****	****	3.89	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/25	****	****	4.01	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	****	4.13	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/29	****	****	4.41	4.52	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 443 01** 

**Title: Adv Topics:Devel Biology** 

**Instructor:** Blumberg, Daphne

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 16

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/14	****	****	4.03	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/10	****	****	3.94	4.17	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means the	re are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

**Course-Section: BIOL 454 01** 

**Title: Vision Science** 

**Instructor: Cronin, Thomas W** 

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 22** 

	_			Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	145/1560	4.92	4.32	4.35	4.45	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	760/1559	4.42	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	442/1371	4.67	4.16	4.38	4.46	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	549/1519	4.50	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	620/1452	4.33	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	700/1430	4.25	3.99	4.16	4.25	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	955/1539	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.21	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	776/1560	4.75	4.83	4.64	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	284/1545	4.23	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	384/1496	4.64	4.51	4.49	4.50	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	500/1498	4.88	4.70	4.75	4.77	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	610/1496	4.33	4.30	4.37	4.40	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	172/1494	4.75	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	148/1352	4.58	4.20	4.12	4.16	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	546/1248	4.43	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1250	5.00	4.28	4.39	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.27	4.45	4.61	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	296/906	4.43	4.02	4.13	4.28	4.43

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 454 01** 

**Title: Vision Science** 

**Instructor: Cronin, Thomas W** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 13

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.18	****

#### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	Α	5	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	4	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:32 PM

**Course-Section: BIOL 454 01** 

**Title: Vision Science** 

**Instructor:** Robinson, Phylli

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 22

·				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	145/1560	4.92	4.32	4.35	4.45	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	760/1559	4.42	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	442/1371	4.67	4.16	4.38	4.46	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	549/1519	4.50	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	620/1452	4.33	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	700/1430	4.25	3.99	4.16	4.25	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	955/1539	4.17	4.21	4.23	4.21	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	776/1560	4.75	4.83	4.64	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	1	8	1	3.82	1172/1545	4.23	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	940/1496	4.64	4.51	4.49	4.50	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	763/1498	4.88	4.70	4.75	4.77	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	1133/1496	4.33	4.30	4.37	4.40	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	632/1494	4.75	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	461/1352	4.58	4.20	4.12	4.16	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	546/1248	4.43	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1250	5.00	4.28	4.39	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.27	4.45	4.61	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	296/906	4.43	4.02	4.13	4.28	4.43

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 454 01** 

**Title: Vision Science** 

**Instructor:** Robinson, Phylli

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 13

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/64	****	****	4.44	4.65	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/58	****	****	4.37	4.40	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/52	****	****	4.41	4.57	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/66	****	****	4.41	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/63	****	****	4.09	4.18	****

#### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	Α	5	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	4	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:32 PM

**Course-Section: BIOL 495 01** 

**Title: Seminar Bioinformatics** 

**Instructor:** Erill Sagales,I

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment:** 6

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1560	4.83	4.32	4.35	4.45	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	201/1559	4.83	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	233/1371	4.83	4.16	4.38	4.46	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	779/1519	4.33	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	620/1452	4.33	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	700/1430	4.25	3.99	4.16	4.25	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.21	4.23	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	622/1560	4.83	4.83	4.64	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	952/1545	3.83	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.51	4.49	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	504/1496	4.83	4.30	4.37	4.40	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	289/1494	4.92	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	215/1352	4.58	4.20	4.12	4.16	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	470/1248	4.50	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1250	4.50	4.28	4.39	4.55	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	677/1239	4.50	4.27	4.45	4.61	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.28	****

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 495 01** 

**Title: Seminar Bioinformatics** 

**Instructor:** Erill Sagales,I

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 6

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	62/206	4.50	4.47	4.25	4.48	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/214	4.50	4.52	4.31	4.37	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/204	5.00	4.56	4.52	4.39	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	105/207	4.50	4.51	4.44	4.49	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/199	5.00	4.47	4.27	4.42	5.00

#### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:32 PM

**Course-Section: BIOL 495 01** 

**Title: Seminar Bioinformatics** 

**Instructor: Kann, Maricel Ga** 

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment:** 6

**Questionnaires:** 6

								structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1560	4.83	4.32	4.35	4.45	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	201/1559	4.83	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	233/1371	4.83	4.16	4.38	4.46	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	779/1519	4.33	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	620/1452	4.33	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	700/1430	4.25	3.99	4.16	4.25	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.21	4.23	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	622/1560	4.83	4.83	4.64	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1264/1545	3.83	4.01	4.14	4.21	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.51	4.49	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1496	4.83	4.30	4.37	4.40	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1494	4.92	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	353/1352	4.58	4.20	4.12	4.16	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	470/1248	4.50	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1250	4.50	4.28	4.39	4.55	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	677/1239	4.50	4.27	4.45	4.61	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.28	****

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:32 PM

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: BIOL 495 01

**Title: Seminar Bioinformatics** 

**Instructor: Kann, Maricel Ga** 

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 6

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	62/206	4.50	4.47	4.25	4.48	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	77/214	4.50	4.52	4.31	4.37	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/204	5.00	4.56	4.52	4.39	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	105/207	4.50	4.51	4.44	4.49	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/199	5.00	4.47	4.27	4.42	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

**Course-Section: BIOL 499L 01** 

Title: Undergrad Research Semin

**Instructor:** Miller, Stephen

Term - Spring 2013

**Enrollment: 9** 

	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean					structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	514/1560	4.63	4.32	4.35	4.45	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	810/1559	4.38	4.23	4.31	4.34	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1371	5.00	4.16	4.38	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	730/1519	4.38	4.09	4.27	4.33	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	620/1452	4.33	4.17	4.18	4.25	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	108/1430	4.88	3.99	4.16	4.25	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1077/1539	4.00	4.21	4.23	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	526/1560	4.88	4.83	4.64	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1545	4.67	4.01	4.14	4.21	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1496	5.00	4.51	4.49	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1498	5.00	4.70	4.75	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	700/1496	4.50	4.30	4.37	4.40	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1147/1494	4.00	4.28	4.37	4.41	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1157/1352	3.50	4.20	4.12	4.16	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	470/1248	4.50	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1250	5.00	4.28	4.39	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1239	5.00	4.27	4.45	4.61	5.00

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

Course-Section: BIOL 499L 01

Title: Undergrad Research Semin

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 8

**Instructor: Miller, Stephen** 

				Fre	quen	cies		In	structor	Course	Org	<b>UMBC</b>	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Discussion														
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/906	****	4.02	4.13	4.28	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	Α	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

**Course-Section: BIOL 636L 01** 

Title: Adv Molec Biol Lab II

**Instructor:** Wolf, Julia B

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 6

						structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.32	4.35	4.37	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	236/1559	4.80	4.23	4.31	4.29	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1371	4.80	4.16	4.38	4.37	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.09	4.27	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	433/1452	4.50	4.17	4.18	4.23	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1430	5.00	3.99	4.16	4.28	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1539	5.00	4.21	4.23	4.26	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.83	4.64	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	546/1545	4.40	4.01	4.14	4.11	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	402/1496	4.80	4.51	4.49	4.47	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	1318/1498	4.40	4.70	4.75	4.76	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	588/1496	4.60	4.30	4.37	4.29	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	850/1494	4.40	4.28	4.37	4.31	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	679/1352	4.20	4.20	4.12	3.99	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	398/1248	4.60	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	542/1250	4.60	4.28	4.39	4.49	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	616/1239	4.60	4.27	4.45	4.57	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/906	5.00	4.02	4.13	4.08	5.00
										-	-	-	_	

# **Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires**

**Course-Section: BIOL 636L 01** 

Title: Adv Molec Biol Lab II

**Instructor:** Wolf, Julia B

Term - Spring 2013

Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 5

				Fre	quen	cies		Ins	structor	Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	62/206	4.50	4.47	4.25	4.17	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	135/214	4.25	4.52	4.31	3.86	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	56/204	4.75	4.56	4.52	4.15	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	176/207	4.00	4.51	4.44	3.84	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	35/199	4.75	4.47	4.27	4.11	4.75

#### **Frequency Distribution**

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP/	4	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	1	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means ther	e are not e	nough responses	
				Р	0			to be significant			
				1	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Run Date: 7/9/2013 2:26:32 PM