Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL

Instructor: SOKO Enrollment: 258 Questionnaires: 171

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 149 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fr	eque	ncie	es.		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	12	5	36	40	75	3.96	1230/1669	4.04	4.05	4.23	4.02	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	8	16	29	60	55	3.82	1295/1666	3.97	3.85	4.19	4.11	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	13	19	29	37	70	3.79	1124/1421	3.94	3.89	4.24	4.11	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	65	7	8	28	29	31	3.67	1301/1617	3.74	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	3	7	23	40	90	4.27	550/1555	3.87	3.75	4.00	3.92	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	96	11	3	16	10	30		1205/1543	3.67	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1		18	34	38	67		1223/1647	4.03	3.80	4.12	4.06	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	0	2		154	4.90		4.92	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		2	10	7					1280/1605		3.67	4.07	3.96	3.66
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5,	2	10	,	55	50	52	3.00	1200/1005	3.70	3.07	1.07	3.70	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	4	17	42	101	4.42	923/1514	4.45	4.24	4.39	4.32	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	2	3	15		123		1135/1551	4.64	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	7	14	27	55			1172/1503	3.99	3.95	4.24	4.17	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	8	18	27	44	66		1189/1506	4.06	3.93	4.26	4.17	3.87
_	11	2	8	10	32								3.68	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	TT	2	8	10	32	37	/ 1	3.97	631/1311	4.05	3.83	3.85	3.08	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	9	7	18	47	62	4.02	840/1490	3.99	3.66	4.05	3.85	4.02
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	6	8	13	36	80	4.23	893/1502	4.19	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	8	5	19	32	78	4.18	966/1489	4.19	3.85	4.29	4.00	4.18
	29 29	26		5 7	22	33								
4. Were special techniques successful	29	20	7	/	22	33	47	3.91	594/1006	3.72	3.90	4.00	3.81	3.91
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	162	6	1	0	2	0	0	2 22	****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	3.98	****
										****				****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	3	0	3	2	1	2.78	****/ 233		4.05	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	164	5	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.52	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	165	2	0	1	1	1	1		****/ 223	****	4.12	4.35	4.19	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	166	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.90	4.15	4.01	****
Quality and														
Seminar	161	5	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	****/ 110	****	****	1 20	1 01	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	164			0	1	0	_		****/ 112	****		4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	166	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97		5.00	4.36	4.19	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	165	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	166	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	166	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work	1	•	2	•	0	_	0	1 00	50	****	F 00	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	166	0	3	0	2	0	0		****/ 58		5.00	4.22	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	168	0	2	0	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	167	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	167	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
Galf Daniel														
Self Paced	1.00	•	-	-	-	,		2 5 5		de de de d	1 00	4 2 4	4 15	ale ale ale d
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	162	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	162	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	162	1	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	162	2	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	162	2	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL

Enrollment: 258
Questionnaires: 171

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 149 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	larned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	;
00-27	33	0.00-0.99	6	 А	32	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	45
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	В	67						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	36	General	4	Under-grad	171	Non-major	126
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	9	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	ſh
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	114				
				?	1						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor:

Enrollment:

207

LAKE, REAGAN Fall 2006

Laboratory

Page 150 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 159 Student Co	urse	Eval	uati	lon ()uest	ionn	naire	2						
			Fr	reque	encie	es		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	7	30	49	69	4.12	1077/1669	4.04	4.05	4.23	4.02	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	10	22	52	70	4.12	1019/1666	3.97	3.85	4.19	4.11	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	11	21	59	63	4.09	939/1421	3.94	3.89	4.24	4.11	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	75	2	7	22	22	27	3.81	1218/1617	3.74	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.81

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

J	_													
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	39	14	14	24	26	35	3.48	1249/1555	3.87	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	107	3	5	13	8	18	3.70	1175/1543	3.67	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	7	26	41	78	4.23	896/1647	4.03	3.80	4.12	4.06	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	2	0	1	0	7	141	4.93	499/1668	4.92	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	40	3	1	5	28	56	26	3.87	1116/1605	3.76	3.67	4.07	3.96	3.87

	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	3	13	46	92	4.47	845/1514	4.45	4.24	4.39	4.32	4.47
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	6	30	116	4.71	973/1551	4.64	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.71
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	2	8	22	60	58	4.09	1020/1503	3.99	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.09
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	4	8	14	44	81	4.26	909/1506	4.06	3.93	4.26	4.17	4.26
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	12	3	8	24	34	67	4.13	519/1311	4.05	3.83	3.85	3.68	4.13

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	8	10	20	30	60	3.97	891/1490	3.99	3.66	4.05	3.85	3.97
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	6	4	20	32	66	4.16	944/1502	4.19	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	2	7	19	35	63	4.19	953/1489	4.18	3.85	4.29	4.07	4.19

3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	2	7	19	35	63	4.19	953/1489	4.18	3.85	4.29	4.07	4.19
4.	Were special techniques successful	32	43	9	6	24	21	24	3.54	750/1006	3.72	3.90	4.00	3.81	3.54

1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	151	1	1	0	2	0	4	3.86 ****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	152	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86 ****/ 233	****	4.05	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	149	3	0	1	1	2	3	4.00 ****/ 225	****	4.52	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	153	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20 ****/ 223	****	4.12	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	153	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20 ****/ 206	****	3.90	4.15	4.01	****

	Seminar													
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****
4.	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
	Field Work													
4.	Did presentations contribute to what you learned Were criteria for grading made clear	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	*

ricia work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/	58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	156	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67 ****/	52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	156	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67 ****/	39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	156	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67 ****/	40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	156	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67 ****/	30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****

field activities 156 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.33 4.30 ****	2	0 1	0	0	0	156	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities
							Self Paced
owhat you learned 156 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 55 **** 1.00 4.34 4.17 ****	3	0 0	0	0	0	156	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned
expected goal 155 0 1 0 0 0 3 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 2.00 4.31 4.08 ****	3	0 0	0	1	0	155	2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal
tor helpful	3	0 0	0	0	0	156	3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
ors helpful 156 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 4.25 ****	3	0 0	0	0	0	156	4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful
the students $$ 156 $$ 0 $$ 0 $$ 3 5.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4.22 ****	3	0 0	0	0	0	156	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students
expected goal 155 0 1 0 0 0 3 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 2.00 4.31 4.08 *** etor helpful 156 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 46 *** *** 4.45 4.26 *** ers helpful 156 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/ 33 **** *** 4.25 4.25 ***	3 3 3	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 0	0 0 0	155 156 156	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 207 Questionnaires: 159 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 150 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	;
00-27	25	0.00-0.99	8	A	37	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	18	1.00-1.99	0	В	48						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	10	C	37	General	5	Under-grad	159	Non-major	140
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	5	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	ſh
				P	0			responses t	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	91				
				?	3						

Course Section: BIOL 100H 0101 University of Maryland CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR Baltimore County Fall 2006

Title Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 151 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Questions							_	ncies	5	_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1669	4.68	4.05	4.23	4.02	4.86
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	472/1666	4.54	3.85	4.19	4.11	4.57
		uestions reflec			0	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	683/1421	4.30	3.89	4.24	4.11	4.40
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	899/1617	3.88	3.83	4.15	3.99	4.17
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1555	4.75	3.75	4.00	3.92	5.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	580/1543	4.17	3.75	4.06	3.86	4.33
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	401/1647	4.59	3.80	4.12	4.06	4.57
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	591/1605	4.42	3.67	4.07	3.96	4.33
		Lectur	_															
1 Were +1	he instr	Lectur uctor's lecture		nrenared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.24	4.39	4.32	5.00
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.55	5.00
				3	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1503	4.83	3.95	4.24	4.17	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	4.50	3.93	4.26	4.17	5.00
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	189/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.68	4.67
			2		_	-		-	-	_	_							
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	3.86	3.66	4.05	3.85	4.71
2. Were a	.ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.68	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.86
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	4.92	3.85	4.29	4.07	5.00
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.50	3.90	4.00	3.81	4.75
				F		- 54-4												
				Frequ	iency	DIS	LTIDU	JLIO.	[1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2						Required for Majors 0 Graduate				 e	0	Majo	 or	3			
28-55								_		J ·						5		-
56-83						Ger	neral	1				1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	4
84-150	34-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0					oonerar r onder graa ,					-							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0 #### -				#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh				
	P 0									responses to be significant								
	I 0					Oth	ner					6						
	? 0																	

Course Section: BIOL 100H 0201 University of Maryland Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR Baltimore County

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR Baltimore of Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS Fall

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Page 152
Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007
Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	590/1669	4.68	4.05	4.23	4.02	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	549/1666	4.54	3.85	4.19	4.11	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	863/1421	4.30	3.89	4.24	4.11	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1334/1617	3.88	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	340/1555	4.75	3.75	4.00	3.92	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	895/1543	4.17	3.75	4.06	3.86	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	367/1647	4.59	3.80	4.12	4.06	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	373/1605	4.42	3.67	4.07	3.96	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared			0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.24	4.39	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.83	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1069/1506	4.50	3.93	4.26	4.17	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1027/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.68	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1328/1490	3.86	3.66	4.05	3.85	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	632/1502	4.68	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.92	3.85	4.29	4.07	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	381/1006		3.90	4.00	3.81	4.25
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****

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

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment:

23 Questionnaires: 14

Page 153 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	2	2	3	3	3.08	1591/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	3.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	9	0	3	3.31	1534/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	3.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	4	1	3.08	1354/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	3.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	2	5	2	3.23	1478/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	6	2	3.46	1257/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	3	2	3.15	1375/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	2	3	3	0	2.42	1596/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	2.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	5	2	1	2	0	2.00	1585/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	3	4	0	2.91	1474/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	2.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1509/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	5	2	3	0	2.64	1460/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	2.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	1	2	1	2	2.45	1464/1506	2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	2.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	0	4	0	2	2.60	1213/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	1	0	1	2.14	1467/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	2.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	1	2	2	0	2.38	1485/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	2.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	1	2	0	2.29	1476/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	2.29
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	873/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	3.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	192/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	183/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	127/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	3	2	3	3	3.33	208/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	3.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	181/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.33
Seminar	1.0		•	•	0	_	-	- 00	***** / 110	als als als als	ale ale ale ale	4 20	4 0 4	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 58	****	5 00	4.22	4.00	****
1. Did field experience concribate to what you rearned	13	O	U	_	U	U	U	2.00	, 50		3.00	1.22	1.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
•		-		-	-	-			,					

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor:

CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 14 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 153 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means t	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to 1	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

The column of th

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 154 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eanei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General	1	0	1	1	_	_	_	2 67	1400/1660	0.07	4 05	4 00	4 00	2 67
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1 0	0	1 2	1 0	6 7	5 7	5 3		1409/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	3.67 3.47
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	2	4	7	3	3		1479/1666	2.72 2.86	3.85 3.89	4.19 4.24	$4.11 \\ 4.11$	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	<i>3</i>	3		1355/1421 1328/1617		3.83	4.15	3.99	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	5	3 7	3.94			3.75	4.15	3.99	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	5	6		1195/1543		3.75	4.06	3.86	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	4	9	1		1474/1647		3.75	4.12	4.06	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	2	15		1068/1668	4.75	4.80	4.12	4.62	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	4	7	2	1.0		1555/1605			4.07	3.96	2.60
y. Non mound you grade one everall codoning erroceromoss		_	_	-	•	-	Ü	2.00	1000, 1000		3.07	1.07	3.70	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	4	6	5	3.47	1394/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	3.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	1404/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	3	7	3	3		1423/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	2	4	5	2		1428/1506			4.26	4.17	2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	3	1	4	7	3.50	939/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	1	4	2	1	2.46	1437/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	2.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	3	4	0	2		1478/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	2.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	1	5	2	0		1475/1489		3.85	4.29	4.07	2.31
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	4	1	2		669/1006		3.90		3.81	3.71
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	71/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.55
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	91/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	72/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	109/ 223		4.12	4.35	4.19	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	138/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	1	1	2 25	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.23	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	3	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	3	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
4. 10 what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	J	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	/ 40			3.71	4.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	0	2	0		****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	2	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	2	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 154 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

The sellmont:

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 155 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	4	5	5	4		1583/1669		4.05	4.23	4.02	3.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	7	4	1	2.71	1619/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	2.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	7	4	6	3	3.14	1339/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	5	4	8	1	2.95	1534/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	2.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	6	7	4	3.43	1287/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	6	8	2	3.14	1379/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	12	3	2	2	2	2.00	1619/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	4	16		1115/1668		4.80	4.67	4.62	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	5	4	8	1	0	2.28	1577/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	6	6	3	2 25	1431/1514	2 00	4.24	4.39	4.32	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	5	8	4		1431/1514	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	5	8	4	0		1466/1503		3.95		4.17	2.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	6	5	4	3	1		1473/1506		3.93	4.24	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	4	2	6	4	4		1104/1311	2.30	3.83	3.85		3.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	U	4	2	ь	4	4	3.10	1104/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.08	3.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	2	1	2	2	2.80	1395/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	1	1	3	3	3.18	1379/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	2	2	1	2	2.70	1449/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	2.70
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	****
- 1														
Laboratory	_	0	0	-	-	_	_	4 00	105/006	2 50	4 10	4 00	2 00	4 00
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	1	6	7 7	4.27	- ,		4.19	4.20	3.98	4.27
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	1	6		4.20		3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	2	0	4	9	4.33	.,	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0 2	0	1	6	7	4.43			4.12	4.35	4.19	4.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	U	2	U	1	8	4	3.80	150/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	,	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation		1	0		0	1	1	4.50	, -	****	****		4.30	****
	18 18	1	0	0 1	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	3.97 4.33	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	1	U	U	U	1	3.00	***/ 30			4.33	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 155 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 156 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 5 8 2 0 0 1.80 1663/1666 2.72 3.85 4.19 4 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 2 4 4 4 1 0 2.15 1419/1421 2.86 3.89 4.24 4	an Mean 02 1.80 11 1.80
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 7 4 4 0 0 1.80 1666/1669 2.97 4.05 4.23 4 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 5 8 2 0 0 1.80 1663/1666 2.72 3.85 4.19 4 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 2 4 4 1 0 2.15 1419/1421 2.86 3.89 4.24 4	11 1.80 11 2.15 99 2.15
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 7 4 4 0 0 1.80 1666/1669 2.97 4.05 4.23 4 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 5 8 2 0 0 1.80 1663/1666 2.72 3.85 4.19 4 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 2 4 4 1 0 2.15 1419/1421 2.86 3.89 4.24 4	11 1.80 11 2.15 99 2.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 5 8 2 0 0 1.80 1663/1666 2.72 3.85 4.19 4 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 2 4 4 4 1 0 2.15 1419/1421 2.86 3.89 4.24 4	11 1.80 11 2.15 99 2.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 2 4 4 4 1 0 2.15 1419/1421 2.86 3.89 4.24 4	11 2.15 99 2.15
	99 2.15
4 Did abbas assistant seed as the assessed seed as 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 1000/1010 0 00 0 00 4 10 0	
	92 2.46
	86 2.00
	06 2.31
·	62 4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 4 1 2 0 0 1.71 1598/1605 2.24 3.67 4.07 3	96 1.71
Lecture	
	32 2.08
	55 2.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 6 6 0 1 0 1.69 1499/1503 2.75 3.95 4.24 4	
	17 1.67
	68 2.33
Discussion	05 1 50
	85 1.50 06 1.83
	06 1.83 07 1.83
	0/ 1.83 81 ****
4. Were special techniques successful 9 3 3 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/1006 3.07 3.90 4.00 3	81
Laboratory	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7 0 0 2 1 4 1 3.50 192/ 226 3.72 4.19 4.20 3	98 3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 0 2 2 1 3 3.63 198/233 3.78 4.05 4.19 4	09 3.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 112/225 4.39 4.52 4.50 4	42 4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 7 0 1 1 4 1 1 3.00 214/223 3.61 4.12 4.35 4	19 3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 7 0 1 1 3 2 1 3.13 186/206 3.29 3.90 4.15 4	01 3.13
Seminar	
	04 ****
· ·	19 ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 4.22 3	79 ****
	94 ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3	90 ****
Field Work	
	00 ****
	81 ****
	30 ****
	00 ****
	30 ****
3. Did conferences help you carry out fred activities 13 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 30 4.33 4	30
Self Paced	
	17 ****
	08 ****
·	26 ****
	25 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 13 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 29 **** **** 4.34 4	22 ****

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor:

CLAASSEN, LARK Enrollment:

23 Questionnaires: 15 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 156 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 157 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eanei	ncies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	7	3	5	3.50	1480/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	3	6	3.56	1449/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	2	7		1128/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	5	3.78	1240/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	4	7	4.00	773/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	8	4	5		1160/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.72
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	2	5	5		1474/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4			939/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	3	5	3	1	2.86	1533/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	6	4	5	3 59	1373/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	3.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	10	2	3		1507/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	4	4	5	2		1420/1503	2.75	3.95		4.17	3.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	4	4	2	2		1438/1506	2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	2.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	3	1	6	2	3		1108/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	3.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	3	3	2		1242/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	2	3	1	2		1424/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	2.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	4	0	3		1393/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	3.10
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	908/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	3.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	123/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.29
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	172/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	126/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.43
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	159/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.71
Seminar			_	_	_		_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14 14	1 0	0	1 1	1 2	0	1	3.33	****/ 105 ****/ 98	****	5.00 ***	4.20 3.95	3.94 3.90	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	U	U	1	2	U	Τ	3.25	***/ 98			3.95	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced		_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 42	***	2.00	4.31	4.08	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15 15	0	0	0	2 2	0	1 1	3.67	****/ 33 ****/ 29	****	****	4.25 4.34	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	ΤЭ	U	U	U	4	U	Τ	3.0/	/ 29			4.34	4.22	

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 157 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0107 Title

CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 20 Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Page 158 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	eque:	ncie	s		Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean		Mean	
	General														
1 Did you gain new	insights, skills from this course	0	0	7	4	3	6	0	2 40	1657/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	2.40
	or make clear the expected goals	0	0	9	2	6	3	0		1656/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	2.15
	stions reflect the expected goals	0	0	7	5	4	4	0		1416/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	2.25
_	tions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	8	5	3	1		1587/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	2.55
	dings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	2	10	2		1354/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.26
3	gnments contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	5	4	4	1		1513/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	2.53
	system clearly explained	0	0	8	7	4	1	0	1.90	1629/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	1.90
8. How many times w		0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	807/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.85
9. How would you gr	ade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	8	7	2	0	0	1.65	1600/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	1.65
	T a whomas														
1 Mana tha instance	Lecture	0	0	2	4	8	2	2	2 00	1474/1514	2 00	1 01	4 20	4 22	2 00
	tor's lectures well prepared or seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	4	4	2	5		1474/1514 1520/1551	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32 4.55	2.90 3.16
	rial presented and explained clearly	1	0	3 4	6	5	3	5		1471/1503	2.75	3.95	4.00	4.55	2.53
	contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	5	1	2	1		1489/1506	2.75	3.93	4.24	4.17	2.05
	techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	5	5	3	2	7		1217/1311		3.83	3.85	3.68	2.58
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance your understanding	1	U	5	0	3	۷	3	2.50	121//1311	2.90	3.03	3.05	3.00	2.30
	Discussion														
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	2	3	1	0	1.92	1477/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	1.92
2. Were all student	s actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	0	5	3	1	2.92	1421/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	2.92
	or encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	6	0	6	0	0	2.00	1481/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	2.00
4. Were special tec	hniques successful	8	9	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	****
	Laboratory														
1. Did the lab incr	ease understanding of the material	12	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	140/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.00
	d with adequate background information	12	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	183/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.75
	aterials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	112/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.63
_	ructor provide assistance	12	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	164/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.00
	s for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	189/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.00
	Frem	1encs	, Dist	-rih	ıtio	n									
	rredi	лспсу	י דפו	الدد در	uc10.										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_	_		
				?	1						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 18

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 159 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Ouestions		MD	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Ran	_	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General																
	new insights, skills from t		2	0	4	3	3	4	2		1628/1		2.97		4.23	4.02	2.81
	ructor make clear the expec		2	0	3	3	5	3	2		1596/1		2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	2.88
	questions reflect the expe aluations reflect the expec			1 2	4 4	4 1	0 1	6	1 2		1392/1 1504/1		2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11 3.99	2.73 3.07
	readings contribute to wha	_	2	1	3	1	5	6 3	3		1404/1		2.99 3.34	3.83 3.75	4.15	3.99	3.07
_	assignments contribute to what	-	3	1	4	1	3	5	1		1472/1		2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	2.86
	ing system clearly explaine	_	2	1	4	1	2	7			1526/1		2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	3.00
_	es was class cancelled	u.	2	1	1	0	0	3			1170/1		4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.53
_	u grade the overall teachin	g effectiveness	7	1	2	2	6	0	0		1568/1			3.67	4.07	3.96	2.40
	Lecture																
	tructor's lectures well pre		2	0	2	4	4	4	2		1457/1		3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	3.00
	ructor seem interested in t		2	0	3	2	4	6	1		1525/1		3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.00
	material presented and expl	_	2	0	4	4	1	6	1		1452/1		2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	2.75
	ures contribute to what you		2	0	4	6	3	2	1		1472/1		2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	2.38
5. Did audiovis	ual techniques enhance your	understanding	3	0	4	2	4	4	1	2.73	1199/1	1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	2.73
1 Did -1 di	Discussion	. 1	11	0	3	1	1	1	1	2 42	1443/1	400	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	2.43
	scussions contribute to wha dents actively encouraged t		11	0	3 4	0	1	1	1		1443/1		2.40	3.86	4.05	4.06	2.43
	ructor encourage fair and o		11	0	4	1	0	2	0		1481/1		2.35	3.85	4.29	4.00	2.29
	techniques successful	pen discussion	11	4	0	1	2	0	0		****/1		3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	****
i. Were special	-			•	Ü	_	2	O	O	2.07	, 1	1000	3.07	3.70	1.00	3.01	
1 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	Laboratory		0	•	0	-	-	-	_	2 60	106/	006	2 50	4 10	4 00	2 00	2 60
	increase understanding of t		8	0	0	1	5 3	1	3	3.60	186/		3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	3.60
	vided with adequate backgro		8	0	0	0	3	4 4	3	4.00	146/		3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09 4.42	4.00
	ry materials available for instructor provide assistan		8	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.00	187/ 142/		4.39 3.61	4.52 4.12	4.50	4.42	4.00
	ments for lab reports clear		8	0	0	1	1	<i>5</i>	3	4.00	117/		3.29	3.90	4.15	4.19	4.30
J. Were require	_	iy specified	0	O	U	1	_	J	,	1.00	11//	200	3.23	3.90	1.13	4.01	4.00
	Seminar	2			_												
_	d topics relevant to the an		17	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/		****	****	4.38	4.04	****
	ructor available for indivi		17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
	projects contribute to wha	-	17 17	0	1 1	0	0	0	0		****/ ****/	92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****
_	tions contribute to what yo a for grading made clear	u learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/		****	****	4.20 3.95	3.94 3.90	****
J. Were Criteria	a for grading made crear		1 /	U	1	U	U	U	U	1.00	/	90			3.93	3.90	
3. Were your co	Self Paced ntacts with the instructor	helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
-		- Frequ	onar	. Diat	- n i bu	1+101	2										
		_	terrey	DISC		10101	.1										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades 				Rea	asons					Тур	pe 			Majors	;
00-27 0 28-55 1	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0	A 5 B 3		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	1	Grad	duate	е	0	Majo	or	3
56-83 0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1		Ger	neral	L				0	Unde	er-gi	rad 1	8	Non-	major	15
84-150 0 Grad. 0	3.00-3.49 1 3.50-4.00 4	D 0 F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	####	‡ – I	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
		P 0		0+1	ner				1	n			es to b			_	
									1	U							

2

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 14 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 160 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	eauer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	-	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1320/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	3.86
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1502/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	3.43
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1222/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	3.50
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	6	3	3.64	1312/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.64
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1054/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.77
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1115/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.79
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	4	4	1	2.86	1552/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	2.86
8.	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	570/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.92
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	7	0	0	2.67	1549/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.67
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	7	2	3.71	1337/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	3.71
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	6	4	3		1480/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.64
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	7	1		1309/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	3.57
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	3	4			1446/1506		3.93		4.17	2.62
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	5	6			861/1311				3.68	
٠.	pro duditivistat committate cimanoc four diadescanding	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	_		Ü	_	3.01	001, 1011	2.70	3.03	3.03	3.00	3.01
	Discussion		_		_	_	_	_							
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	0	1		1265/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	3.25
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	0			1301/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	3.50
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	1			1361/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	3.25
4.	Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	0	2	0	Τ	3.00	923/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	3.00
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	140/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.00
	Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	189/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.70
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	149/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.30
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	160/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.10
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	168/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.56
-	Seminar		-	0	0	-	0	-	4 00	/ 110	ale ale ale ale	ale ale ale ale	4 20	4 0 4	****
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 112	****	* * * * *	4.38	4.04	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3.	Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4.	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
	Self Paced														
1	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****
٠.	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I		•	-	-	-	_	-		, 2,					

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 160 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

CLAASSEN, LARK

Instructor:

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 161 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	3	0	4	2	2.77	1631/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	2.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	10	0	1	0	1	1.50	1666/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	1.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	3	1	1	2	2.23	1416/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	2.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	4	1	5	0	1		1600/1617		3.83	4.15	3.99	2.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	3	2	3		1461/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	2.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	3	2	1		1523/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	2.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	9	0	2	2	0		1632/1647		3.80	4.12	4.06	1.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	8		1170/1668		4.80	4.67	4.62	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	2	2	1	0	2.00	1585/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	3	4	2	1		1483/1514		4.24	4.39	4.32	2.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	4	2	4		1489/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4 6	2	1	3	1		1469/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	2.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1 1	1	6	3	0 2	1 2			1496/1506	2.38		4.26	4.17	1.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	U	ь	U	2	2	2	2.50	1227/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	2	0	1		1461/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	2.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	5	1	2	1	0		1499/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	1.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	4 6	0 3	3 2	4 0	2 1	0 1	0	2.25	1484/1489 996/1006	2.35 3.07	3.85 3.90	4.29	4.07 3.81	1.89
4. Were special techniques successiul	0	3	2	U	1	1	U	2.25	990/1000	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.01	2.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	5	0	3	1	1	2.30	226/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	2.30
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	2	2	4	1	3.20	217/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0 5	0	1	3	6 1	4.50	127/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.50 2.10
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	5 6	1 1	3 2	0	1	2.10	221/ 223 205/ 206	3.61 3.29	4.12 3.90	4.35 4.15	4.19 4.01	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	U	0		2	U	Τ	1.90	205/ 206	3.49	3.90	4.15	4.01	1.90
Seminar	11	0	0	0	1	1	_	2 50	4444/110			4 20	1 01	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11 11	0	0 1	0	1 1	1 0	0	3.50	****/ 112 ****/ 97	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97 ****/ 92	****	5.00 5.00	4.36 4.22	4.19 3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 105	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
-		Ü	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	3.00	, ,			0.75	3.70	
Field Work					_									
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	***	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	^^^		4.33	4.30	* * * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 161 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 162 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaue	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	5	8	4	0	2.83	1626/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	2.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	8	8	0	0	2.33	1648/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	2.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	4	8	3	0	2.71	1395/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	2.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	5	8	2	0	2.59	1585/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	2.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	4	5	2	3.00	1427/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	4	7	1	1	2.56	1507/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	2.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	11	2	3	1	0	1.65	1634/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	1.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	5	2	5	1	0	2.15	1581/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.15
<u> </u>														
Lecture	2	0	0	1	_	7	0	2 10	1441/1514	2 00	1 0 1	4 20	4 20	2 10
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	-	0	4	6	7			1441/1514		4.24	4.39	4.32	3.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	4	5	4	3		1504/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	11 3	1 4			1423/1503	2.75	3.95		4.17	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	4		_	1		1438/1506	2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	2.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	2	7	3	2	3.06	1108/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	3.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	3	2	1	0	2.43	1443/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	2.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	6	1	0	0		1495/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	3	3	0	0		1480/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	2.13
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	1	2	0	0		****/1006	3.07		4.00	3.81	****
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	2	0	2	5	1	3.30	204/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	3.30
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	2	2	5	1	3.50	203/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	220/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	3.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	6	3	1	0	0	1.50	222/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	1.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	4	1	1	4	0	2.50	202/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	2.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	2	0	0	Λ	2 00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	0	0		,	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 98	****	****		3.90	****
J. Here criteria for grading made crear		_	_	J	O	J	J	1.00	, 50			3.75	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	***
0.15 7 1														
Self Paced	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	1 17	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned				1	0	-	0	3.00	, 55				4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	1 0	1		0	0	1.50	****/ 42 ****/ 46	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1			0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46 ****/ 33	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17 17	1	0 1	1	0	0	0		****/ 29	****	****	4.25	4.25 4.22	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	Ι/	Τ	Τ	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 29			4.34	4.22	

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAAS

CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 162 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 19

23

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 163 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	cies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	4	6	2	3	2.79	1630/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	2.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	2	6	2	3	2.78	1613/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	2.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	7	2	5	2	2.79	1387/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	2.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	3	3		1516/1617			4.15	3.99	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	8	1	5		1319/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	4	5			1474/1543	2.97		4.06	3.86	2.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	3	5	3			1599/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	2.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	3			1004/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	6	5	5	2	1		1575/1605		3.67	4.07		2.32
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	O	O	O	5	5	2	_	2.52	1373/1003	2.21	3.07	1.07	3.70	2.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	0	6	4	4	3 22	1435/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	3.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	4	4	5	4	2		1546/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	2.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	2	7	4	2		1437/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	2.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	2	4	3	2		1467/1506	2.73	3.93	4.24	4.17	2.42
<del>_</del>	1	0	o 4	4	4	4	2		1191/1311					2.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	U	4	4	4	4	2	2.78	1191/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	2.78
Discussion														
	0	0	7	0	2	0	1	1 01	1 470 /1 400	0 40	2 66	4 05	2 05	1 01
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	-	3	0	1		1478/1490	2.40		4.05	3.85	1.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	4	4	2	0	1		1493/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	2.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	4	1	3	1	1		1472/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	2.40
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	****
- 1														
Laboratory	0	-	0	0	0		2	2 60	100/006	2 50	4 10	4 00	2 00	2 60
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	2	0	0	4	3	3.67	180/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	3.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	203/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	2	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	165/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	164/ 223	3.61		4.35	4.19	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	177/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.40
Seminar		_	_	_		_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****
Field Work		_		_		_								
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAAS

CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 163 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	3						

THE HUMAN ORGANISM

Title Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 84

Questionnaires: 58

Fall 2006

Page 164 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	0	2	1	1 1	1 2	2.0	4 10	1102/1660	1 10	4 05	4 00	4 00	4 10
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insights, skills from this course</li> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0	2 1	1 3	14 9	13 18	28 27	4.10	1103/1669 993/1666	4.10 4.16	4.05	4.23 4.19	4.02 4.11	4.10 4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	9	18	25	4.16	965/1421	4.16	3.85 3.89	4.19	4.11	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	40	1	1	5	4	25 6		1246/1617	3.76	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	10	8	5	11	15		1354/1555	3.76	3.75	4.15	3.99	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	45	2	1	2	2			****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	7	13	_		775/1647	4.33	3.80	4.12	4.06	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	0	12	41		1004/1668	4.72	4.80		4.62	4.72
-	16	1	2	1	7	19			1057/1605		3.67			3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	10	40	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.24	4.39	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	4	7	42	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	2	17	33	4.48	588/1503	4.48	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	3	3	9	38	4.55	604/1506	4.55	3.93	4.26	4.17	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	1	2	16	30	4.53	250/1311	4.53	3.83	3.85	3.68	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	7	3	4	8	9		1246/1490	3.29	3.66	4.05	3.85	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	1	9	6	12		1001/1502	4.04	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	1	1	4	7	15	4.21	941/1489	4.21	3.85	4.29	4.07	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	28	22	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	3.81	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	4	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 233	****	4.05	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	57	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 225	****	4.52	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	57	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 223	****	4.12	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.90	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar	<b>5</b> 6		0	•	-	-	•	2 50	**** / 110	****		4 20	4 04	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0 1	0	0	0	1 1	0		****/ 97 ****/ 92	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
<ol> <li>Did research projects contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	56 57	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 105	****	5.00	4.22	3.79 3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	57	U	U	U	U		U	4.00	/ 96			3.93	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced	_													
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Course Section: BIOL 106 0101 Title

THE HUMAN ORGANISM

Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 84 Questionnaires: 58 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 164 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	19						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	13	General	3	Under-grad	58	Non-major	57
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 21

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 165 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General				_		_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	5	10		1110/1669		4.05	4.23	4.02	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	472/1666	4.19	3.85	4.19	4.11	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	538/1421	3.98	3.89	4.24	4.11	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	12	4.38	662/1617		3.83	4.15	3.99	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7 0	2 1	0	4	3	5		1148/1555	3.73	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	U T	1	3 0	10 2	7 18	4.05 4.76	869/1543		3.75	4.06	3.86	4.05 4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.76	204/1647 357/1668	4.32 4.95	3.80 4.80	4.12	4.06	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	11	∠∪ 4	4.95	769/1605		3.67	4.67 4.07	4.62 3.96	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	U	U	U	1	TT	4	4.19	709/1005	4.13	3.07	4.07	3.90	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	189/1514	4.79	4.24	4.39	4.32	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	307/1551	4.88	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	277/1503	4.63	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	225/1506	4.69	3.93	4.26	4.17	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	174/1311	4.67	3.83	3.85	3.68	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	6	1	3.93	923/1490	3.87	3.66	4.05	3.85	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	754/1502	4.23	3.86	4.05	4.06	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	-	4.73	456/1489		3.85	4.29	4.00	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	1	0	0	1	3		****/1006			4.00	3.81	****
I. Here special committees successful	ŭ		_	Ü	Ŭ	-		1.00	, 1000	1.01	3.70	1.00	3.01	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	29/ 226	4.52	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	75/ 233	4.35	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.63
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	38/ 225	4.64	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	85/ 223	4.40	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	76/ 206	4.49	3.90	4.15	4.01	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 165 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	0						

Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

The court of the care of the c

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 17

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 166 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	ncie	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	633/1669	4.02	4.05	4.23	4.02	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	527/1666	4.19	3.85	4.19	4.11	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	670/1421	3.98	3.89	4.24	4.11	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	626/1617	4.16	3.83	4.15	3.99	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	2	3	4		1227/1555	3.73	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	747/1543	3.79	3.75	4.06	3.86	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4		4.65	324/1647		3.80	4.12	4.06	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.95	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	591/1605	4.13	3.67	4.07	3.96	4.33
<u> </u>														
Lecture	•		•	0	-	-	1 -	4 00	205/1514	4 50	4 0 4	4 20	4 20	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1		15	4.82	325/1514		4.24	4.39	4.32	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	732/1551	4.88	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	266/1503	4.63	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	,	4.69	3.93	4.26	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	169/1311	4.67	3.83	3.85	3.68	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	808/1490	3.87	3.66	4.05	3.85	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	754/1502	4.23	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	500/1489	4.56	3.85	4.29	4.07	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	1	2	0		3.63	717/1006	4.01	3.90	4.00		3.63
i. Were special ecciniques successivi	,	2	_	_	2	U	-	3.03	71771000	1.01	3.70	1.00	3.01	3.03
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	56/ 226	4.52	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	40/ 233	4.35	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	68/ 225	4.64	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	55/ 223	4.40	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	41/ 206		3.90	4.15		4.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
0-16 Parad														
Self Paced	1.0	0	^	0	^	^	1	F 00	****/ FF		1 00	1 21	4 1 17	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46 ****/ 33	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16 16	0	0	0	0	0	1 1	5.00	****/ 33 ****/ 29		****	4.25 4.34	4.25 4.22	****
J. Were there enough procedrs for all the students	Τ0	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 29			4.34	4.44	

Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 166 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	e are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	lgnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 167 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	6	2	3 46	1498/1669	4.02	4 05	4.23	4.02	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	4	2		1516/1666		3.85	4.19	4.11	3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	1	4	2		1357/1421	3.98	3.89	4.24	4.11	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	1	5	3		1372/1617	4.16	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	1	4	1		1192/1555	3.73	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	1	6	1		1344/1543	3.79	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	1411/1647	4.32	3.80	4.12	4.06	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	570/1668	4.95	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1210/1605	4.13	3.67	4.07	3.96	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	631/1514	4.79	4.24	4.39	4.32	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	760/1551	4.88	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	861/1503	4.63	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4		4.45	706/1506		3.93	4.26	4.17	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	246/1311	4.67	3.83	3.85	3.68	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	2	4	1		1328/1490		3.66	4.05	3.85	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	1	3	3		1338/1502	4.23	3.86	4.26	4.06	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	1	3			1168/1489	4.56	3.85	4.29	4.07	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1006	4.01	3.90	4.00	3.81	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	129/ 226	4.52	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	201/ 233	4.35	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	1	0	3	1		3.78	208/ 225	4.64	4.52	4.50	4.42	3.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	186/ 223	4.40	4.12	4.35	4.19	3.78
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	150/ 206	4.49	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	***	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****

Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 167 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

Course Section: BIOL 109 0104 Un

Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 15

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 168 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	0	0	0	3	8	1	4 07	1131/1669	4.02	4.05	4.23	4 02	4 07
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	4 8	4.07	868/1666	4.02	3.85	4.23	4.02 4.11	4.07 4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	8 6	4.27	969/1421	3.98	3.85	4.19	4.11	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	7	4.00	695/1421	4.16	3.83	4.15	3.99	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0		0	1	0	5	4	4.36	611/1555	3.73	3.83	4.15	3.99	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	5	3		1195/1543	3.79	3.75	4.00	3.94	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	651/1647	4.32	3.75	4.12	4.06	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668				4.06	
•	0	0	0	0	0	11	15 4	4.27	678/1605	4.95 4.13	4.80 3.67	4.67 4.07		5.00 4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	U	ΤŢ	4	4.2/	6/8/1605	4.13	3.67	4.07	3.96	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	360/1514	4.79	4.24	4.39	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	358/1551	4.88	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	300/1503	4.63	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	380/1506	4.69	3.93	4.26	4.17	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	153/1311	4.67	3.83	3.85	3.68	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	535/1490		3.66	4.05	3.85	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	438/1502	4.23	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	4.56	3.85	4.29	4.07	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	307/1006	4.01	3.90	4.00	3.81	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	2	1	0	4.33	116/ 226	4.52	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.33	105/ 233	4.35	4.19	4.19	4.09	4.33
			0	Τ	Τ.	٥	12							
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	-	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 225	4.64	4.52	4.50	4.42	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.33	138/ 223	4.40	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	U	U	U	0	2	10	4.83	41/ 206	4.49	3.90	4.15	4.01	4.83

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

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I

Instructor:

Enrollment: 154 Questionnaires: 94

Baltimore County FLEISCHMANN, ES Fall 2006

Page 169 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	6	14	73	4.72	306/1669	4.72	4.05	4.23	4.34	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	8	22	60	4.47	591/1666	4.47	3.85	4.19	4.29	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	26	58	4.47	594/1421	4.47	3.89	4.24	4.35	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	59	2	1	4	4	23	4.32	728/1617	4.32	3.83	4.15	4.24	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	2	1	14	22	46	4.28	533/1555	4.28	3.75	4.00	3.96	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	69	1	2	4	4	13	4.08	844/1543	4.08	3.75		4.10	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	4	7	17		4.40	651/1647	4.40	3.80	4.12	4.19	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	91	4.96	357/1668	4.96	4.80	4.67	4.59	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	9	36	36	4.30	631/1605	4.30	3.67	4.07	4.15	4.30
Lecture	2	0	2	2	2	20		4 45	077/1514	4 4 5	1 0 1	4 20	4 20	4 45
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	-	2	3	2	29		4.45	877/1514		4.24	4.39	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	4	86	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.46	4.66	4.72	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3 5		21	62	4.52	546/1503	4.52	3.95	4.24	4.29	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	-	1	18	68	4.62	534/1506	4.62	3.93	4.26		4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	30	3	2	10	14	32	4.15	513/1311	4.15	3.83	3.85	3.96	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	68	0	4	2	6	2	12	3.62	1112/1490	3.62	3.66	4.05	4.11	3.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	68	0	4	2	5	1	14		1219/1502	3.73	3.86	4.26	4.31	3.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	68	0	2	4	5	3	12		1200/1489	3.73	3.85	4.29	4.36	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	68	17	2	0	1	0	6		****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	3.99	****
I Hold Special Committees Successful	0.0		_	Ü	_	ŭ	·	5.05	, 1000		3.70	1.00	3.77	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	85	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	4.42	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	86	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	****/ 233	****	4.05	4.19	4.36	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	85	1	1	0	1	1	5		****/ 225	****	4.52	4.50	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	86	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	****/ 223	****	4.12	4.35	4.71	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	86	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 206	****	3.90	4.15	4.59	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	93	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	***
Field Work	0.0	0	_	_	•	•	-	F 00		also also also also	F 00	4 00	4 00	***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.20	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	93	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	93	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	93	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	93	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.67	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00		5.00	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	93	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 46	****	∠.UU ****	4.31 4.45	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	00	****/ 33	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	93	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 29	****	****		5.00	****
J. Here there enough proceds for all the scudents	23	J	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	/ 29			T.JT	5.00	

Course Section: BIOL 251 0101

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES

Enrollment: 154
Questionnaires: 94

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 169 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	 1	A	38	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	13
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	В	31	Conoral					
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	12	C	5	General	13	Under-grad	93	Non-major	81
84-150	20	3.00-3.49	24	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	22	F	1	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	2			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	65				
				?	6						

Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION

Instructor: OMLAND, KEVIN E (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 221 Questionnaires: 118 University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Page 170 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fr	eane	ncie	g		Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect			
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did vo	u gain ne	General w insights,skil	•	is source	1	0	1	1	12	48	55	4.32	828/1669	4.32	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.32
_	-	ctor make clear			3	0	0	1	26	53	35		1059/1666		3.85	4.19	4.20	4.06
		estions reflect			7	0	1	2	21	50	37	4.08			3.89	4.24	4.25	4.08
	_	ations reflect	_	-	3	41	1	4	19	34	16		1218/1617		3.83	4.15	4.22	3.81
		adings contribu			8	1	11	8	38	28	24		1287/1555		3.75	4.00	4.03	3.42
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute to what	at you learned	9	45	6	9	11	22	16	3.52	1256/1543	3.52	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.52
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	explained		9	0	0	4	14	46	45	4.21	907/1647	4.21	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.21
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		7	0	0	1	1	2	107	4.94	499/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.94
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	l teaching	effectiveness	21	0	0	0	25	48	24	3.99	952/1605	3.98	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.98
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well prepa	ared	8	0	0	1	7	32	70	4.55	739/1514	4.65	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.65
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem intere	sted in the	e subject	8	0	0	0	1	17	92	4.83	732/1551	4.81	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.81
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clear bid the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	4	7	38	60	4.41	702/1503	4.39	3.95	4.24	4.28	4.39
4. Did th	e lecture	learned	11	0	0	2	6	26	73	4.59	566/1506	4.59	3.93	4.26	4.30	4.59		
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	nance your w	understanding	12	8	3	3	14	31	47	4.18	489/1311	4.33	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.33
		Discuss																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	you learned	71	0	1	0	10	12	24	4.23	709/1490	4.23	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.23	
2. Were a	ll studen	participate	71	0	0	0	7	13	27	4.43	729/1502	4.43	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.43		
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage f	air and ope	en discussion	71	0	0	0	6	12	29	4.49	707/1489	4.49	3.85	4.29	4.35	4.49
4. Were s	special te	chniques succes	sful		70	12	1	2	9	11	13	3.92	594/1006	3.92	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.92
		Laborat	ory															
1. Did th	ne lab inc	rease understan	ding of the	e material	115	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	4.17	****
		Field W	Jork															
1. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribut	e to what	you learned	116	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did yo	ou clearly	understand you	ır evaluatio	on criteria	117	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****
		Self P	aced															
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contribu	ite to what	you learned	117	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did st	udy quest	ions make clear	the expect	ted goal	116	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****
			Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	xpected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Тъ	pe			Majors	t.		
		Cum. GPA																
00-27 28-55	4 16	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	3 0	A 35 B 43		Re	quir	ed f	or M	lajor	S	5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	44
56-83	16		10	C 11		Ge	nera	1				9	Under-g	rad 11	.8	Non-	-major	74
84-150	D 2									_				-				
Grad.	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh			
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
	I 0						her				8	32						

Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION

Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 171 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 221 Questionnaires: 118

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

•	UMBC Leve Mean Mea	
**************************************		
**************************************		
	4.23 4.3	28 4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 0 1 26 53 35 4.06 1059/1666 4.06 3.85	4.19 4.3	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 7 0 1 2 21 50 37 4.08 939/1421 4.08 3.89	4.24 4.3	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 41 1 4 19 34 16 3.81 1218/1617 3.81 3.83	4.15 4.3	22 3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8 1 11 8 38 28 24 3.42 1287/1555 3.42 3.75	4.00 4.0	03 3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9 45 6 9 11 22 16 3.52 1256/1543 3.52 3.75	4.06 4.3	14 3.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 9 0 0 4 14 46 45 4.21 907/1647 4.21 3.80	4.12 4.3	14 4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled 7 0 0 1 1 2 107 4.94 499/1668 4.94 4.80	4.67 4.6	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 25 2 1 0 19 49 22 4.00 918/1605 3.98 3.67	4.07 4.0	09 3.98
Lecture		
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 19 0 0 1 2 25 71 4.68 569/1514 4.65 4.24	4.39 4.4	46 4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 19 0 0 0 17 82 4.83 732/1551 4.81 4.46	4.66 4.	70 4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 19 0 0 1 10 32 56 4.44 653/1503 4.39 3.95	4.24 4.3	28 4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 7 20 72 4.66 484/1506 4.59 3.93	4.26 4.3	30 4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 21 2 2 0 11 27 55 4.40 333/1311 4.33 3.83	3.85 3.9	97 4.33
Discussion		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 71 0 1 0 10 12 24 4.23 709/1490 4.23 3.66	4.05 4.3	11 4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 71 0 0 0 7 13 27 4.43 729/1502 4.43 3.86	4.26 4.3	28 4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 71 0 0 0 6 12 29 4.49 707/1489 4.49 3.85	4.29 4.3	35 4.49
4. Were special techniques successful 70 12 1 2 9 11 13 3.92 594/1006 3.92 3.90	4.00 4.3	10 3.92
Laboratory		
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 115 2 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 226 **** 4.19	4.20 4.3	17 ****
Field Work		
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 116 0 2 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00	4.22 4.3	29 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 117 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00	4.06 3.	59 ****
Self Paced		
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 117 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 1.00	4.34 4.0	03 ****
	4.31 4.3	13 ****
Frequency Distribution		
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type	Majo	iora
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 3 A 35 Required for Majors 5 Graduate 0	Major	44
28-55	Non-mod	ior 74
84-150 15 3.00-3.49 18 D 2	Non-maj	01 /4
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 17 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there as	re not en	ıoııah
		0 0 311
P 0 responses to be sign:		
P 0 responses to be sign: I 0 Other 82		

Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION FREELAND, STEPH (Instr. C)

Instructor: Enrollment: 221 Questionnaires: 118

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 172 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener																
1 Did you a	rain new			m this course	1	0	1	1	12	48	55	4.32	828/1669	4.32	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.32
1 0	•			mected goals	3	0	0	1	26	53	35		1059/1666		3.85	4.19	4.20	4.06
				xpected goals	7	0	1	2	21	50	37	4.08	939/1421	4.08	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.08
	_			pected goals	3	41	1	4	19	34	16		1218/1617		3.83	4.15	4.22	3.81
				what you learned	8	1	11	8	38	28	24		1287/1555	3.42	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.42
	•	_		o what you learned	9	45		9	11	22	16		1256/1543		3.75	4.06	4.14	3.52
7. Was the g					9	0	0	4	14	46	45	4.21	907/1647		3.80	4.12	4.14	4.21
3. How many	_	-			7	0	0	1	1	2	107	4.94	499/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.94
				hing effectiveness	32	0	2	3	15	42	24	3.97	987/1605	3.98	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.98
		Lectu	re															
1. Were the	instruct			prepared	28	0	0	1	2	18	69	4.72	489/1514	4.65	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.65
				n the subject	28	0	0	1	1	14	74	4.79	825/1551		4.46	4.66	4.70	4.81
				xplained clearly	29	0	2	2	8	30	47	4.33	811/1503		3.95	4.24	4.28	4.39
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						2	1	5	20	61		613/1506		3.93	4.26	4.30	4.59
				-	29 30	0 1	3	1	8	21	54	4.40	333/1311		3.83	3.85	3.97	
		Discu	ggion															
l Did class	diaduaa	what you learned	71	0	1	0	10	12	24	4.23	709/1490	4.23	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.23		
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learne Were all students actively encouraged to participat						0	0	7	13	27	4.43	729/1502		3.86	4.26	4.28	4.43
		-		d open discussion	71 71	0	0	0	6	12	29	4.49	707/1489		3.85	4.29	4.35	4.49
4. Were spec				a open alboabbion	70	12	1	2	9	11	13	3.92	594/1006		3.90	4.00	4.10	3.92
		Labora	atory															
1. Did the l	ab incre			f the material	115	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	4.17	****
		Field	Work															
1. Did field	l experie	ence contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	116	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	***
				uation criteria	117	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	***	5.00	4.06	3.59	****
		Self	Paced															
1. Did self-	paced sv	~ ~ ~ ~		what you learned	117	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	***
				xpected goal	116	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 42		2.00	4.31		***
	Frequ	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n												
Credits Earn	Expected Grades				P.e	ason	a a			Ty	ne			Majors	2			
											- 							
00-27 28-55 1	4	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	3 0	A 35 B 43		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	`S	5	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	44
28-55 I 56-83 I		2.00-2.99	10	В 43 С 11		Go.	nera	1				9	Under-g	rad 11	8	Non-	-major	74
84-150 15 3.00-3.49 18 D 2						Ge.	c.a	_				,	onder -g	-uu 11		11011-	101	7 7
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 17 F 0						E1.	ecti	ves				1	#### - :	Means +	here a	are not	enoue	лh
	Frag. 0 3.50-4.00 1/ F 0											_	respons				_	,
				I O		Ot.	her				8	32	10050110		91			
				? 4		00.						-						

MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI

Title Instructor: GETHMANN, RICHA

Enrollment: 340 Questionnaires: 147 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 173 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions					NA		eque 2			5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did v	ou dain ne			om this course	3	0	1	3	11	48	81	4 42	705/1669	4.42	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.42
		ctor make clear			4	0	3	11	26	44			1088/1666		3.85	4.19		4.01
				expected goals	4	0	7	15	30	40			1121/1421		3.89	4.24	4.25	3.79
		ations reflect			4	109	2	4	4	6	18		****/1617		3.83	4.15	4.22	****
				what you learned	4	14	37	23	27	21	21	2.74	1493/1555	2.74	3.75	4.00	4.03	2.74
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contr	ribute	to what you learned	4	120	0	4	6	4	9	3.78	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	4.14	****
7. Was th	he grading	g system clearl	y expl	ained	4	1	7	5	27	37	66	4.06	1017/1647	4.06	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.06
	-	was class cand			5	1	0	1	0	2	138	4.96			4.80	4.67	4.68	4.96
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	all tea	ching effectiveness	24	3	1	4	21	57	37	4.04	891/1605	4.04	3.67	4.07	4.09	4.04
		Lectur	re															
		actor's lecture			7	0	0	3	7	31	99	4.61				4.39	4.46	4.61
				in the subject	7	0	0	2	4		117	4.78			4.46	4.66		4.78
				explained clearly	8	0	1	4		49	68	4.29			3.95	4.24	4.28	4.29
		es contribute t		-	7	0	0	2	11	30		4.59	,		3.93	4.26		4.59
5. Did a	udiovisual	your understanding	9	51	7	8	26	18	28	3.60	894/1311	3.60	3.83	3.85	3.97	3.60		
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did c	lass discu	assions contrib	oute to	what you learned	123	0	5	1	5	8	5	3.29	****/1490	****	3.66	4.05	4.11	****
				ed to participate	124	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	****/1502	****	3.86	4.26	4.28	****
				nd open discussion		0	1	1	4	7	10		****/1489		3.85	4.29	4.35	****
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	essful		123	19	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.10	****
		Self																
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contrib	oute to	what you learned	146	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits I	Earned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	рe			Majors			
00-27	00-27 6 0.00-0.99 1 A 42							ed f	or M	 la jor	 :s	1	 Graduat	 .e	0	Majo	 or	78
28-55	36	1.00-1.99	0	В 49						. ,						5		
56-83	25	2.00-2.99	13	C 32		Ge	nera	1				2	Under-9	rad 14	<u>1</u> 7	Non-	major	69
84-150																		
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 51 F 0						ecti	ves				2	#### -				_	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
	I 0 2 10						her				12	:7						

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Title

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 174 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	8	9	4.26	901/1669	4.34	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	2	10		1094/1666	4.08	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	894/1421	4.33	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	911/1617	4.13	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	773/1555	3.66	3.75	4.00	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	8	7	4.06	863/1543	3.97	3.75	4.06	4.14	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	1	7	7		1043/1647		3.80	4.12	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	-	4.78	939/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	9	3		1124/1605		3.67	4.07	4.09	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	2	5	9	3.95	1241/1514	4.27	4.24	4.39	4.46	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	1	4	12	4.37	1289/1551	4.53	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	4	5	7	3.68	1269/1503	3.81	3.95	4.24	4.28	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	6	8	3.89	1179/1506	3.97	3.93	4.26	4.30	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	4	4	8	4.06	562/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	824/1490	4.26	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	859/1502	4.26	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	941/1489	4.25	3.85	4.29	4.35	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	759/1006	3.66	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	0	0	5	9	4.19	132/ 226	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.17	4.19
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	170/ 233	4.03	4.05	4.19	4.13	3.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	2	2	2	9	4.00	187/ 225	4.40	4.52	4.50	4.45	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	2	4	8	4.00	164/ 223	4.36	4.12	4.35	4.27	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	0	4	1	9	3.94	131/ 206	3.86	3.90	4.15	4.08	3.94
Seminar							_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	***	****	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	***	5.00	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2 2	5.00	****/ 92 ****/ 105	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17 16	0	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 98	****	5.00 ***	4.20 3.95	4.45 4.15	****
		J	-	Ü	Ü	_	-	3.33	, , ,			3.75	1110	
Field Work	1.0	0	0	0	0	_	-	F 00	50	ate ate ate ate	F 00	4 00	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17 17	0	1	0	0	0 1	1 1	3.00 4.50	****/ 40 ****/ 30	****	****	3.97 4.33	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out freta accivities	Ι/	U	U	U	U	Т	Τ	4.50	/ 30			4.33	3.49	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor:

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 19

SANDOZ, JAMES W

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 174 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 175 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General		_		_		_	_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	6		852/1669			4.23	4.28	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	4		1206/1666	4.08	3.85	4.19	4.20	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	773/1421	4.33	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	4		1140/1617		3.83	4.15	4.22	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	4	2		1227/1555	3.66	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3 2	3	5		1068/1543	3.97	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	-	0	0	0	0	6 1	5	4.23	885/1647	3.91	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	2	3	3	4.92	641/1668	4.94		4.67	4.68	4.92 3.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	U	2	2	3	3	3.70	1249/1605	3.94	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1174/1514	4.27	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	1127/1551	4.53	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1205/1503	3.81	3.95	4.24	4.28	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1219/1506	3.97	3.93	4.26	4.30	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	818/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.97	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	622/1490		3.66	4.05	4.11	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1502	4.26	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	953/1489	4.25	3.85	4.29	4.35	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1006	3.66	3.90	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	77/ 226	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.17	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	5		4.17	127/ 233	4.03	4.05	4.19	4.13	4.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	119/ 225	4.40	4.52	4.50	4.45	4.58
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	146/ 223	4.36	4.12	4.35	4.27	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	146/ 206	3.86	3.90	4.15	4.08	3.83
	_		-	_	_	-	-							
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.22	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	^^^/ 30	***		4.33	3.49	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 13

SANDOZ, JAMES W Fall 2006

Page 175 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme

3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned

4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned

5. Were criteria for grading made clear

2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16

Title Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

Enrollment: 24 Ouestionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

0 4.00 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.53

0 4.00 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.12

0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 105 **** 5.00 4.20 4.45 **** 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 4.15 ****

**** 5.00 4.22 4.47 ****

Page 176

Ou a stri an s	NID	NT 70	Fre	equei 2	ncie	S 4	5		tructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA 						Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	10	4	4.00	1173/1669	4.34	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	975/1666	4.08	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	781/1421	4.33	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	1029/1617	4.13	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	7	3	3.53	1217/1555	3.66	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	969/1543	3.97	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	6	4	3.59	1361/1647	3.91	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	654/1605	3.94	3.67	4.07	4.09	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	647/1514	4.27	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	880/1551	4.53	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1035/1503	3.81	3.95	4.24	4.28	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	858/1506	3.97	3.93	4.26	4.30	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	557/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	849/1490	4.26	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	1013/1502	4.26	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	684/1489	4.25	3.85	4.29	4.35	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1006	3.66	3.90	4.00	4.10	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	77/ 226	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.17	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	131/ 233	4.03	4.05	4.19	4.13	4.14
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	107/ 225	4.40	4.52	4.50	4.45	4.64
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	156/ 223	4.36	4.12	4.35	4.27	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	152/ 206	3.86	3.90	4.15	4.08	3.79

# 0 Frequency Distribution

0

0

0

0

0 0 1

1

0 4.00 ****/ 92

16

16

16

16 0

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-		_	
				2	Λ						

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Title Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 21

25

Fall 2006

Page 177 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
~~~~~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	567/1669	4.34	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	908/1666	4.08	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	538/1421	4.33	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	717/1617	4.13	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	4	6	5	3.71	1104/1555	3.66	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	680/1543	3.97	3.75	4.06	4.14	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	5	8	3.86	1205/1647	3.91	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	357/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	759/1605	3.94	3.67	4.07	4.09	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	600/1514	4.27	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1069/1551	4.53	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	7	6	5	3.74	1245/1503	3.81	3.95	4.24	4.28	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	942/1506	3.97	3.93	4.26	4.30	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	3	2	11	4.11	531/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	824/1490	4.26	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	754/1502	4.26	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	1	3	4	4	3.33	1341/1489	4.25	3.85	4.29	4.35	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	2	0	2	5	3.80	643/1006	3.66	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	5	2	13	4.40	102/ 226	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.17	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	100/ 233	4.03	4.05	4.19	4.13	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	2	0	17	4.65	105/ 225	4.40	4.52	4.50	4.45	4.65
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	2	1	16	4.55	103/ 223	4.36	4.12	4.35	4.27	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	3	1	4	12	4.25	103/ 206	3.86	3.90	4.15	4.08	4.25
Seminar	1 77	0	^	0	^	_	_	4 50	4444/110			4 20	4 52	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	2	2		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.45	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	U	2	1	4.33	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	Ο	4 00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	5.00			****
			0	0		0	0			****	****	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20 20	0 0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39 ****/ 40	****	****	4.39 3.97	3.82	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations						-	_		, 10	****			3.34	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30		****	4.33	3.49	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	1	_		****/ 29	****	****		4.13	****
5. Here there chads proceeds for all the students	17	0	0	_	0	_	0	3.00	, 25			1.51	1.13	

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor:

Baltimore County SANDOZ, JAMES W Fall 2006

Page 177 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 22

SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 178 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	633/1669	4.34	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	0	5	9	4.06	1065/1666	4.08	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	728/1421	4.33	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	887/1617	4.13	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	1163/1555	3.66	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	1	8	3.88	1035/1543	3.97	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	2	9		1178/1647		3.80	4.12	4.14	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	864/1605		3.67	4.07	4.09	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	775/1514	4.27	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	1055/1551	4.53	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	6	6		1127/1503		3.95	4.24	4.28	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	973/1506	3.97	3.93	4.26	4.30	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	1	8	5	4.07	557/1311		3.83	3.85	3.97	4.07
5. 21a addiovidual ocominques emanee your andersoanding	_	_	_	Ü	-	Ü		1.07	33,,1311	1.00	3.03	3.03	J.,	1.07
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	422/1490	4.26	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	926/1502	4.26	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	564/1489	4.25	3.85	4.29	4.35	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	694/1006			4.00	4.10	3.67
		_	_	_	-	_	-							
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	116/ 226	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.17	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	1	2	3	7	3.80	178/ 233	4.03	4.05	4.19	4.13	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	3	1	0	11	4.27	155/ 225	4.40	4.52	4.50	4.45	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	98/ 223	4.36	4.12	4.35	4.27	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	5	1		3.67	163/ 206	3.86	3.90	4.15	4.08	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****
	= :	-	•	•	_	-			, , , , , ,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
		-	-	-		-	_		, 33					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Title Instructor:

Baltimore County SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A) Fall 2006

Page 178 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 18

22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB (Instr. B)

Instructor:

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 18

Fall 2006

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 179 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	ı Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	----------	----------

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC :		Sect Mean
General	_		_		_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	633/1669	4.34		4.23	4.28	4.47
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	1	0	2	1	0 3	5 5	9	4.06	1065/1666	4.08	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.06 4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1 1	0	0	1	3	5 5	-	4.35	728/1421 887/1617	4.33		4.24 4.15	4.25	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	<i>5</i>	5	4		1163/1555	3.66	3.75	4.15	4.22	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	1	8		1035/1543	3.97	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	2	9		1178/1647		3.80	4.12	4.14	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668		4.80	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	1	4	0		1357/1605	3.94		4.07	4.09	3.79
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1307/1514	4.27	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	1	0	1	3		1361/1551	4.53	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1301/1503	3.81		4.24	4.28	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	2			1347/1506	3.97	3.93		4.30	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.07
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	422/1400	1 26	2 66	4 OE	4.11	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.55	422/1490 926/1502	4.26 4.26	3.66 3.86	4.05 4.26	4.11	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3 4	7	4.18	564/1489	4.25		4.26	4.28	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	694/1006		3.90	4.29		3.67
4. Were special techniques successiui	,	5	1	Т	U	Т	3	3.07	694/1006	3.00	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.07
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	116/ 226	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.17	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	1	2	3	7	3.80	178/ 233	4.03	4.05	4.19	4.13	3.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	3	1	0	11	4.27	155/ 225	4.40	4.52	4.50	4.45	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	98/ 223	4.36	4.12	4.35	4.27	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	5	1	6	3.67	163/ 206	3.86	3.90	4.15	4.08	3.67
Seminar	1.0	-	0	•	0	0	-	F 00	/ 110	****	****	4 20	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 112	****		4.38	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	U	U	U	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	* * * * *	5.00	4.22	4.47	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****
Self Paced	1 -		6		-	_	_	2 25		at at 1 t	1 00	4 0 4	4 00	ate at a 1 1
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 42		2.00	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17 17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33 ****/ 29	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	Ι/	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 29			4.34	4.13	

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: (Instr. B

Enrollment: 22

(Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 179 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

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

Instructor: KLOETZEL, JOHN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 195

Questionnaires: 67

Fall 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 180

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

					Fre	_	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Cours	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did vou gain ne	ew insights, skills from this cours	se	1	0	1	1	11	29	24	4.12	1077/166	9 4.12	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.12
	ctor make clear the expected goals		1	0	1	6	14	32	13		1334/166			4.19	4.20	3.76
	mestions reflect the expected goal		2	0	2	8	20	19	16		1189/142			4.24	4.25	3.60
_	uations reflect the expected goals		1	46	2	0	4	8	6		1224/161		3.83	4.15	4.22	3.80
	eadings contribute to what you lea		1	1	3	6	19	20	17	3.65	1148/155	5 3.65	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.65
_	signments contribute to what you l		2	53	3	0	4	2	3		****/154		3.75	4.06	4.14	***
7. Was the grading	g system clearly explained		1	0	5	6	13	14	28	3.82	1241/164	7 3.82	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.82
8. How many times	was class cancelled		1	1	0	0	0	1	64	4.98	143/166	8 4.98	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.98
9. How would you	grade the overall teaching effecti	veness	8	3	0	1	11	29	15	4.04	897/160	5 3.62	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.62
	Lecture															
1. Were the instri	ructor's lectures well prepared		2	0	0	1	5	15	44	4.57	727/151	4 4.60	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.60
	ctor seem interested in the subject	•+	2	0	0	0	5	15	45		1097/155			4.66	4.70	4.65
	terial presented and explained cle		3	0	0	3	11	26	24		1015/150			4.24	4.28	3.87
	es contribute to what you learned	20117	2	0	0	3	11	18	33	4.25	917/150			4.26	4.30	3.99
	1 techniques enhance your understa	anding	4	20	4	2	11	13			839/131					
	Discussion															
1. Did class disc	cussions contribute to what you lea	arned	48	0	6	2	1	6	4	3.00	1328/149	0 3.00	3.66	4.05	4.11	3.00
	nts actively encouraged to partici		48	0	1	3	8	3	4		1363/150			4.26	4.28	3.32
	ctor encourage fair and open discu	_	49	0	2	3	6	4	3		1379/1489		3.85	4.29	4.35	3.17
	echniques successful		48	15	1	1	1	0	1		****/100			4.00	4.10	****
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab in	crease understanding of the materi	ial	65	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 22	б ****	4.19	4.20	4.17	****
	Field Work															
1. Did field exper	rience contribute to what you lear	ned	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 5	8 ****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****
	y understand your evaluation crite		66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 5	2 ****	5.00	4.06	3.59	***
	ctor available for consultation		66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 3	9 ****	****	4.39	3.82	***
4. To what degree	could you discuss your evaluation	ns	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 4	0 ****	****	3.97	3.34	****
5. Did conferences	s help you carry out field activit	ies	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 3	0 ****	****	4.33	3.49	****
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced	system contribute to what you lea	arned	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 5	5 ****	1.00	4.34	4.03	***
_	tions make clear the expected goal		66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 4:	2 ****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****
	acts with the instructor helpful		66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 4	6 ****	****	4.45	4.13	***
_	.ck/tutoring by proctors helpful		66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 3	3 ****	****	4.25	3.00	***
	ugh proctors for all the students		66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 2	9 ****	****	4.34	4.13	****
		Freque	ncy	Dist	ribu	ıtic	n									
Condita Barrad	Com CDN Formants		_			D.		_			m-				Ma	
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected						ason				1	уре 			Majors 	,
00-27 2		21 26		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s	1	Gradua	te	0	Majo	or	32
28-55 1 56-83 15	26 L1		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-	grad	67	Non-	-major	35	
84-150 10	0													-		
Grad. 0		0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0		Means			_	ŗh
		0		Oth	ıer				5	7	respon	ses to	ne sigr	ııııcar	16	
	±	1		0.01					J	,						

1

Course Section: BIOL 303 0101 University of Maryland Page 181 JAN 18, 2007

Title CELL BIOLOGY Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 195

Ouestionnaires: 67

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 1 1 11 29 24 4.12 1077/1669 4.12 4.05 4.23 4.28 4.12 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 6 14 32 13 3.76 1334/1666 3.76 3.85 4.19 4.20 3.76 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 2 8 20 19 16 3.60 1189/1421 3.60 3.89 4.24 4.25 3.60 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 46 2 0 4 8 6 3.80 1224/1617 3.80 3.83 4.15 4.22 3.80 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 3 6 19 20 17 3.65 1148/1555 3.65 3.75 4.00 4.03 3.65 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 53 3 0 4 2 3 3.17 ****/1543 **** 3.75 4.06 4.14 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 5 6 13 14 28 3.82 1241/1647 3.82 3.80 4.12 4.14 3.82 1 1 0 0 0 1 64 4.98 143/1668 4.98 4.80 4.67 4.68 4.98 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 2 3 7 24 18 3 3.20 1470/1605 3.62 3.67 4.07 4.09 3.62 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 11 0 0 0 5 11 40 4.63 647/1514 4.60 4.24 4.39 4.46 4.60 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 0 0 3 12 43 4.69 1000/1551 4.65 4.46 4.66 4.70 4.65 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 10 0 3 10 10 16 18 3.63 1289/1503 3.87 3.95 4.24 4.28 3.87 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 6 6 12 8 26 3.72 1254/1506 3.99 3.93 4.26 4.30 3.99 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 2 3 3 8 18 25 4.04 572/1311 3.85 3.83 3.85 3.97 3.85 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 48 0 1 6 4 3.00 1328/1490 3.00 3.66 4.05 4.11 3.00 3 8 3 4 3.32 1363/1502 3.32 3.86 4.26 4.28 3.32 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 48 0 1 4. Were special techniques successful 48 15 1 1 1 0 1 2.75 ****/1006 **** 3.90 4.00 4.10 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 65 1 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 **** 226 **** 4.19 4.20 4.17 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 0 4.00 ****/ 58 **** 5.00 4.22 4.29 **** 66 0 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 66 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.06 3.59 **** 66 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.39 3.82 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 66 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 40 **** 3.97 3.34 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 66 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.33 3.49 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 66 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 1.00 4.34 4.03 **** 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 42 **** 2.00 4.31 4.13 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 66 0 0 Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
 Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 66 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 46 **** **** 4.45 4.13 **** 66 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** **** 4.25 3.00 **** 66 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 29 **** **** 4.34 4.13 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Majors 0.00-0.99 0 Required for Majors 1 Graduate 0 00-27 Major 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 в 26 C 11 56-83 15 2.00-2.99 4 General 0 Under-grad 67 Non-major 35 3.00-3.49 12 D 0 84-150 10 F 0 Electives Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 14 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 57

Course Section: BIOL 303L 0102 University of Maryland Title CELL BIOLOGY LAB Baltimore County MACKAY, BRYAN

Fall 2006

Instructor: Enrollment: 149

Questionnaires: 106

Page 182 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluatio:	n Questi	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	----------	----------

Questions					Fr	eque	ncie	:S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	1															
1. Did you gain new	General	om this source	1	0	0	2	4	36	63	4.52	567/1669	4.52	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.52
2. Did the instructor			1	0	0	1	2	23	79	4.71	293/1666	4.71	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.52
3. Did the exam ques			1	0	1	3	10	36	55	4.71	737/1421		3.89	4.24	4.25	4.71
4. Did other evaluat		_	2	3	1	1	6	36	57	4.46	568/1617	4.46	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.46
5. Did assigned read		_	4	12	0	4	13	24	49	4.40	508/1517		3.75	4.15	4.22	4.40
6. Did written assign			3	2	1	1	18	39	42	4.19	735/1543	4.19	3.75	4.06	4.14	4.19
7. Was the grading s		-	3	0	0	0	10 7	28	68	4.19	378/1647	4.19	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.19
8. How many times wa		ained	2	0	0	0	0	6	98	4.94	428/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.94
9. How would you gra		ahina offoatiwanaga	5	1	0	0	3	31	66	4.63	268/1605		3.67		4.09	4.63
9. How would you gra	de the Overall tead	ching effectiveness	5	1	U	U	3	31	00	4.03	200/1005	4.03	3.07	4.07	4.09	4.03
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	or's lectures well	prepared	8	0	0	0	0	8	90	4.92	170/1514	4.92	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.92
2. Did the instructo	r seem interested :	in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	17	81	4.83	732/1551	4.83	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.83
3. Was lecture mater	ial presented and e	explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	15	81	4.84	182/1503	4.84	3.95	4.24	4.28	4.84
4. Did the lectures			9	0	0	0	4	17	76	4.74	367/1506	4.74	3.93	4.26	4.30	4.74
5. Did audiovisual t		=	13	40	2	1	12	19	19	3.98	609/1311	3.98	3.83	3.85	3.97	3.98
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss		_	70	0	1	2	4	6	23	4.33	622/1490		3.66	4.05	4.11	4.33
2. Were all students			71	0	0	1	4	8	22	4.46	693/1502		3.86	4.26	4.28	4.46
3. Did the instructor	-	nd open discussion	72	0	0	1	2	12	19	4.44	753/1489		3.85	4.29	4.35	4.44
4. Were special tech	niques successful		74	10	4	0	4	5	9	3.68	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.10	****
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab incre	_	of the material	20	0	0	2	6	23	55	4.52	74/ 226	4.52	4.19	4.20	4.17	4.52
2. Were you provided	_		19	0	1	2	3	11	70	4.69	62/ 233	4.69	4.05	4.19	4.13	4.69
3. Were necessary ma	_	_	19	0	0	1	1	20	65	4.71	90/ 225		4.52	4.50	4.45	4.71
4. Did the lab instr			19	0	0	0	6	13	68	4.71	75/ 223	4.71	4.12	4.35	4.27	4.71
5. Were requirements	_		19	0	0	0	3	19	65	4.71	51/ 206	4.71	3.90	4.15	4.27	4.71
o. were requirements	TOT TAD TEPOTES C.	rearry specified	13	U	U	U	3	19	0.5	4./1	51/ 200	4.71	3.90	4.13	4.00	4./1
	Seminar															
1. Were assigned top	ics relevant to the	e announced theme	103	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****
	Field Work															
1. Did field experie		what wou learned	105	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****
2. Did you clearly u		-	105	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52		5.00	4.06	3.59	****
2. 214 /04 010411/ 4	naorpouna your ova	Idaoion ollocila		Ü	Ü	Ü	ŭ	Ü	_	3.00	, 32		3.00	1.00	3.33	
	Self Paced															
 Did self-paced sy 		-	105	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****
2. Did study question		_	105	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****
3. Were your contact		_	105	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	***
4. Was the feedback/		_	105	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough	proctors for all	the students	105	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****
		Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Tv	pe			Majors	}

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	38	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0	Major	57
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	39					
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	13	C	5	General	1	Under-grad 106	Non-major	49
84-150	37	3.00-3.49	23	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there	are not enoug	h

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 87 ? 5

Course Section: BIOL 304 0101 University of Maryland Page 183
Title PLANT BIOLOGY Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: MILLER, STEPHEN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 223
Questionnaires: 146

Fall 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Questions								Fr	_	ncie	s			tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights skills from this course 3 0 2 3 22 5 4 62 4.20 988/1669 4.20 4.05 4.23 4.28 4.20 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 0 7 7 1 62 43 .99 1122/1666 3.99 3.85 4.19 4.20 3.73 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4 0 6 14 29 56 37 3.73 1141/1421 3.73 3.89 4.24 4.25 3.73 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 42 6 10 22 31 30 3.70 1284/1617 3.70 3.83 4.15 4.22 3.70 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 42 6 10 22 31 30 3.70 1284/1617 3.70 3.83 4.15 4.22 3.70 6. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7 89 6 4 12 16 12 3.48 1268/1553 2.93 3.75 4.06 4.14 3.48 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.03			Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights skills from this course 3 0 2 3 22 5 4 62 4.20 988/1669 4.20 4.05 4.23 4.28 4.20 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 0 7 7 1 62 43 .99 1122/1666 3.99 3.85 4.19 4.20 3.73 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4 0 6 14 29 56 37 3.73 1141/1421 3.73 3.89 4.24 4.25 3.73 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 42 6 10 22 31 30 3.70 1284/1617 3.70 3.83 4.15 4.22 3.70 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 42 6 10 22 31 30 3.70 1284/1617 3.70 3.83 4.15 4.22 3.70 6. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7 89 6 4 12 16 12 3.48 1268/1553 2.93 3.75 4.06 4.14 3.48 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.03 4.03			Genera	 al															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1. Did vo	ou gain ne			m this course	3	0	2	3	22	54	62	4.20	988/1669	4.20	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	_	_	J ,			3													
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 42 6 10 22 31 30 3.70 1284/1617 3.70 3.83 4.15 4.22 3.70 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 45 24 8 29 21 14 2.93 1461/1555 2.93 3.75 4.00 4.03 2.93 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 89 6 4 12 16 12 3.48 1268/1543 3.48 3.75 4.00 4.03 2.93 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 89 6 4 12 16 12 3.48 1268/1543 3.48 3.75 4.00 4.03 2.93 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 2 0 0 1 2 135 4.97 214/1668 4.97 4.80 4.67 4.08 4.97 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 17 2 3 12 56 43 13 3.40 1400/1605 3.79 3.67 4.07 4.09 3.79 1.00 4.09 3.79 1.00 4.00 4.09 3.79 1.00 4.00 4.09 3.79 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00						4	0	6	14										
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned of 1 do		_			_			6		22	31	30						4.22	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 889 6 4 12 16 12 3.48 128/1543 3.48 3.75 4.06 4.14 3.48 7.5 Was the grading system clearly explained 6 2 4 8 24 46 56 4.03 1032/1647 4.03 3.80 4.12 4.14 4.03 8. How many times was class cancelled 6 2 0 0 1 2 135 4.97 214/1668 4.97 4.80 4.67 4.68 4.97 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 17 2 3 12 56 43 13 3.40 1400/1605 3.79 3.67 4.07 4.09 3.79 Lecture Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 1 2 9 44 86 4.49 814/1514 4.64 4.24 4.39 4.46 4.64 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 2 11 29 100 4.60 1119/1551 4.75 4.46 4.66 4.70 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 9 19 36 40 37 3.55 1318/1503 4.02 3.95 4.24 4.28 4.02 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 8 5 23 36 69 4.09 1033/1506 4.32 3.93 4.26 4.30 4.32 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 25 1 6 24 29 53 4.12 525/1311 4.17 3.83 3.85 3.97 4.17 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 117 0 7 0 3 9 10 3.52 ****/1490 **** 3.66 4.05 4.11 **** 3.01 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02								24										4.03	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 6 2 4 8 24 46 56 4.03 1032/1647 4.03 3.80 4.12 4.14 4.03 8. How many times was class cancelled 6 2 0 0 1 2 135 4.97 214/1668 4.97 4.80 4.67 4.68 4.97 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 17 2 3 12 56 43 13 3.40 1400/1605 3.79 3.67 4.07 4.09 3.79 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 1 2 9 44 86 4.49 814/1514 4.64 4.24 4.39 4.46 4.64 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 2 11 29 100 4.60 1119/1551 4.75 4.46 4.66 4.70 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 9 19 36 40 37 3.55 1318/1503 4.02 3.95 4.24 4.28 4.02 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 8 5 23 36 69 4.09 1033/1506 4.32 3.93 4.26 4.30 4.32 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 25 1 6 24 29 53 4.12 525/1311 4.17 3.83 3.85 3.97 4.17 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 117 0 7 0 3 9 10 3.52 ****/1490 **** 3.66 4.05 4.11 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 118 0 1 1 3 5 18 4.36 ****/1502 **** 3.86 4.26 4.28 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 118 0 1 0 4 6 17 4.36 ****/1489 **** 3.85 4.29 4.35 **** 4. Were special techniques successful Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 123 **Prequency Distribution** **Prequency Distribution** **Prequency Distribution** **Prequency Distribution** **General** Quinder-grad 146 Non-major 23 **Add 1400/1605 3.79 4.07 4.09 3.50 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.00 4.10 **** **Add 1400/1605 3.79 3.67 4.07 4.09 3.79 **Add 1400/1605 3.79 3.67 4.09 3.50 4.09 4.09 4.00 4.10 **** **Add 1400/1605 3.79 3.67 4.09 4.80 4.09 4.09 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0							89	6	4	12	16	12	3.48	1268/1543	3.48	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled 6 2 0 0 1 1 2 135 4.97 214/1668 4.97 4.80 4.67 4.68 4.97 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 17 2 3 12 56 43 13 3.40 1400/1605 3.79 3.67 4.07 4.09 3.79 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 1 2 9 44 86 4.49 814/1514 4.64 4.24 4.39 4.46 4.64 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 2 11 29 100 4.60 1119/1551 4.75 4.46 4.66 4.70 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 9 19 36 40 37 3.55 1318/1503 4.02 3.95 4.24 4.02 4.03 4.35 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 25 1 6 24 29 53 4.12 525/1311 4.17 3.83 3.85 3.97 4.17 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 117 0 7 0 3 9 10 3.52 ****/1490 **** 3.66 4.05 4.11 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 118 0 1 1 3 5 18 4.36 ****/1502 **** 3.86 4.26 4.28 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 118 0 1 0 4 6 17 4.36 ****/1409 **** 3.85 4.29 4.35 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 17						6	2	4	8	24	46	56	4.03	1032/1647	4.03	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.03
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						6	2	0	0	1	2	135	4.97	214/1668	4.97	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.97
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all teac	hing effectiveness	17	2	3	12	56	43	13	3.40	1400/1605	3.79	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.79
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 1 2 9 44 86 4.49 814/1514 4.64 4.24 4.39 4.46 4.64 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 2 11 29 100 4.60 1119/1551 4.75 4.46 4.66 4.70 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 9 19 36 40 37 3.55 1318/1503 4.02 3.95 4.24 4.28 4.02 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 8 5 23 36 69 4.09 1033/1506 4.32 3.93 4.26 4.30 4.32 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 25 1 6 24 29 53 4.12 525/1311 4.17 3.83 3.85 3.97 4.17 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 117 0 7 0 3 9 10 3.52 ****/1490 **** 3.66 4.05 4.11 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 118 0 1 1 3 5 18 4.36 ****/1502 **** 3.86 4.26 4.28 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 118 0 1 0 4 6 17 4.36 ****/1489 **** 3.85 4.29 4.35 **** 4. Were special techniques successful Discussion Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Sum GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Graduate Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Graduate Sum General Sum																			
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject																			
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 9 19 36 40 37 3.55 1318/1503 4.02 3.95 4.24 4.28 4.02 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 8 5 23 36 69 4.09 1033/1506 4.32 3.93 4.26 4.30 4.32 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 25 1 6 24 29 53 4.12 525/1311 4.17 3.83 3.85 3.97 4.17 Discussion 1. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 117 0 7 0 3 9 10 3.52 ****/1490 **** 3.66 4.05 4.11 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 118 0 1 1 3 5 18 4.36 ****/1502 **** 3.86 4.26 4.28 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 118 0 1 0 4 6 17 4.36 ****/1489 **** 3.85 4.29 4.35 **** 4. Were special techniques successful Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 0 0.00-0.99 2 A 47 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 123 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 48 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 15 C 19 General 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Gradu. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant								_	2								4.39	4.46	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 8 5 23 36 69 4.09 1033/1506 4.32 3.93 4.26 4.30 4.32 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 25 1 6 24 29 53 4.12 525/1311 4.17 3.83 3.85 3.97 4.17 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 117 0 7 0 3 9 10 3.52 ****/1490 **** 3.66 4.05 4.11 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 118 0 1 1 3 5 18 4.36 ****/1502 **** 3.86 4.26 4.28 *** 4.8 Were special techniques successful 118 0 1 0 4 6 17 4.36 ****/1489 **** 3.85 4.29 4.35 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 117 18 1 1 0 3 6 4.09 ****/1006 **** 3.90 4.00 4.10 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 2 A 47 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 123 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 48 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 15 C 19 General 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Graduate P 0 Selectives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					-													4.70	4.75
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 117 0 7 0 3 9 10 3.52 ****/1490 **** 3.66 4.05 4.11 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 118 0 1 1 3 5 18 4.36 ****/1502 **** 3.86 4.26 4.28 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 118 0 1 0 4 6 17 4.36 ****/1489 **** 3.85 4.29 4.35 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 117 18 1 1 0 3 6 4.09 ****/1006 **** 3.90 4.00 4.10 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 2 A 47 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 123 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 48 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 15 C 19 General 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			_		-			-											
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 117 0 7 0 3 9 10 3.52 ****/1490 **** 3.66 4.05 4.11 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 118 0 1 1 3 5 18 4.36 ****/1502 **** 3.86 4.26 4.28 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 118 0 1 0 4 6 17 4.36 ****/1489 **** 3.85 4.29 4.35 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 117 18 1 1 0 3 6 4.09 ****/1006 **** 3.90 4.00 4.10 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 2 A 47 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 123 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 48 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 15 C 19 General 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Electives 1 ### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					-		-	_	-										
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 117 0 7 0 3 9 10 3.52 ****/1490 **** 3.66 4.05 4.11 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 118 0 1 1 3 5 18 4.36 ****/1502 **** 3.86 4.26 4.28 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 118 0 1 0 4 6 17 4.36 ****/1489 **** 3.85 4.29 4.35 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 117 18 1 1 0 3 6 4.09 ****/1006 **** 3.90 4.00 4.10 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 2 A 47 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 123 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 48 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 15 C 19 General 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques er	our understanding	8	25	1	6	24	29	53	4.12	525/1311	4.17	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.17	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 117 0 7 0 3 9 10 3.52 ****/1490 **** 3.66 4.05 4.11 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 118 0 1 1 3 5 18 4.36 ****/1502 **** 3.86 4.26 4.28 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 118 0 1 0 4 6 17 4.36 ****/1489 **** 3.85 4.29 4.35 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 117 18 1 1 0 3 6 4.09 ****/1006 **** 3.90 4.00 4.10 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 2 A 47 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 123 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 48 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 15 C 19 General 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			Diggue	ggion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 118 0 1 1 3 5 18 4.36 ****/1502 **** 3.86 4.26 4.28 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 118 0 1 0 4 6 17 4.36 ****/1489 **** 3.85 4.29 4.35 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 117 18 1 1 0 3 6 4.09 ****/1006 **** 3.90 4.00 4.10 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 2 A 47 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 123 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 48 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 15 C 19 General 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Graduate 0 Non-major 23 Graduate 0 Seneral 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 24 Seneral 0 Seneral 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	1 Did c	lace diec			what you learned	117	Λ	7	Λ	3	a	1.0	3 52	****/1490	****	3 66	4 05	4 11	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 118 0 1 0 4 6 17 4.36 ****/1489 **** 3.85 4.29 4.35 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 117 18 1 1 0 3 6 4.09 ****/1006 **** 3.90 4.00 4.10 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 2 A 47 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 123 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 48 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 15 C 19 General 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							-	-	-	-	5			,					****
4. Were special techniques successful 117 18 1 1 0 3 6 4.09 ****/1006 **** 3.90 4.00 4.10 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 2 A 47 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 123 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 48 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 15 C 19 General 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant														,					****
Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 2 A 47 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 123 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 48 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 15 C 19 General 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					a open arroassion						-			,					****
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 2 A 47 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 123 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 48 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 15 C 19 General 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			1																
00-27					Freq	uency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 48 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 15 C 19 General 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 48 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 15 C 19 General 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 2 A 47								ed f	or M	 lajor		0	 Graduat	 e	0	Maic	 or	123
56-83 10 2.00-2.99 15 C 19 General 2 Under-grad 146 Non-major 23 84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		-						1			,		-		-	-) ~		
84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant		10					Ge	nera	1				2	Under-a	rad 14	:6	Non-	-major	23
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant														5				3	
P 0 responses to be significant		0	0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0 Elect						ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
	P 0																	_	
I 0 Other 128					I O		Ot	her				12	8	-					
? 11					? 11														

Course Section: BIOL 304 0101 University of Maryland Page 184 Title PLANT BIOLOGY Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Fall 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Enrollment: 223 (Instr. B)

Questionnaires: 146 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 544		Gener			2	0	2	2	2.2	г л	<i>c</i> 2	4 00	988/1669	4.20	4 05	4.23	4 20	4 20
		ew insignis,sk ctor make clea:		om this course	3	0	0	3 7	22 31	54 62	62 43	4.20	1122/1666	3.99	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.20 3.99
				expected goals	4	0	6	14	31 29	6∠ 56	37		1141/1421	3.99	3.89	4.19	4.20	3.99
		uations reflec				42	6	10	22	31	30		1284/1617	3.73	3.83	4.15	4.23	3.70
				what you learned	5 5	45	24	8	29	21	14		1461/1555	2.93	3.75	4.15	4.22	2.93
	_	_		to what you learned	7	89	4 4 6	4	12	16	12		1268/1543	3.48	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.48
		g system clear:		-	6	2	4	8	24	46	56		1032/1647	4.03	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.03
		was class can		ained	6	2	0	0	1		135	4.97	214/1668	4.03	4.80	4.12	4.68	4.03
	_			ching effectiveness		2	1	1	16	43	40	4.19	769/1605		3.67	4.07	4.09	3.79
J. 110W W	Julu you	grade the over	all tea	ching effectiveness	43	4	_	_	10	13	40	4.10	709/1003	3.19	3.07	1.07	4.00	3.19
		Lectu	re															
1 Were t	the instr	uctor's lectur		prepared	37	0	0	0	3	18	88	4.78	408/1514	4.64	4 24	4.39	4.46	4.64
				in the subject	37	0	0	0	1		100	4.91	512/1551	4.75	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.75
				explained clearly	40	0	0	2	8	31	65	4.50	556/1503		3.95	4.24	4.28	4.02
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	2	1	8	21	76	4.56	594/1506	4.32	3.93	4.26	4.30	4.32
	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				38 43		1	6	12	21	45	4.21	470/1311			3.85		4.17
	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding																	
		Discu	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contri	bute to	what you learned	117	0	7	0	3	9	10	3.52	****/1490	****	3.66	4.05	4.11	****
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively e	ncourag	ed to participate	118	0	1	1	3	5	18	4.36	****/1502	****	3.86	4.26	4.28	****
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	118	0	1	0	4	6	17	4.36	****/1489	****	3.85	4.29	4.35	****
4. Were s	special to	echniques succ	essful		117	18	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.10	****
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 2	A 47			aui r	ed f	 or M	 Ia ior		0	Graduat		0	Majc		123
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 48		100	quii	eu I	OI I	ia joi	. 5	U	Graduat	_	U	Majo) <u> </u>	123
56-83				C 19		Ge	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 14	6	Non-	major	23
84-150 59 3.00-3.49 32 D 0				50		-				-	onacı g.		. •	1,011		23		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 31 F 0					El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh	
						respons				_	,							
				I O		Other 128				28	-		5					
? 11																		

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course Section: BIOL 397W 0101 Page 185 Title SCIENTIFIC WRITING JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 5

0	uestionnaires:	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.05	4.23	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	3.85	4.19	4.20	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1617	5.00	3.83	4.15	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	171/1555	4.75	3.75	4.00	4.03	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.75	4.06	4.14	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	213/1647	4.75	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1605	5.00	3.67	4.07	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.24	4.39	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	5.00	3.95	4.24	4.28	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	3.93	4.26	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	264/1311	4.50	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.50

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

Course Section: BIOL 411 0101 University of Maryland BACTERIAL PHYSIOLOGY Baltimore County Instructor: SCHREIER, HAROL

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

37

Page 186 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1					1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1 0 1 3 4 15 4.43 690/1669 4.43 4.05 4.23 4.39 1 1 2 7 12 4.22 935/1666 4.22 3.85 4.19 4.22 0 1 2 8 12 4.35 737/1421 4.35 3.89 4.24 4.38 1 0 2 3 2 3.63 1323/1617 3.63 3.83 4.15 4.22 2 4 6 3 8 3.48 1249/1555 3.48 3.75 4.00 4.08 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 ****/1543 **** 3.75 4.00 4.08 0 0 2 1 2 4.00 ****/1543 **** 3.75 4.06 4.18 0 0 0 4 4 15 4.48 532/1647 4.48 3.80 4.12 4.14 0 0 0 5 18 4.78 926/1668 4.78 4.80 4.67 4.70 0 0 1 9 6 4.31 617/1605 4.31 3.67 4.07 4.16										
1. Did vo	nı gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	690/1669	4.43	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.43
		ctor make clear			0	0	-	_	-									4.22
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	8	12							4.35
	_	uations reflect		_	1	14	1	0	2	3	2	3.63					4.22	3.63
				what you learned	0	0	2	4	6	3	8	3.48	1249/1555	3.48	3.75	4.00	4.08	3.48
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	17	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	4.18	****
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	532/1647	4.48	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.48
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	926/1668	4.78	4.80	4.67	4.70	4.78
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	617/1605	4.31	3.67	4.07	4.16	4.31
		Lectur	0															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	nrenared	0	0	Λ	1	1	3	1.8	4 65	600/1514	4 65	4 24	4 39	4 45	4.65
					0	0				_								4.91
	 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 					0	0		3	_	14	4.39	730/1503					4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1		18	4.74	380/1506					4.74
				our understanding	0	3	0	1	3	8			507/1311		3.83	3.93 4.26 4.29		4.15
		Discus																
1 Did al	000 0100			what you learned	13	0	3	0	2	1	2	2 10	1317/1490	2 10	3.66	4 OE	4.26	3.10
				d to participate	12		2	0	1	1			1172/1502			4.05	4.46	
				d open discussion	13	0	1	0	2	1			1013/1489		3.85	4.29	4.52	4.10
		echniques succe		d open discussion	13	7	0	0	3	0			****/1006		3.90		4.21	****
	_	-																
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 8		100	-1		- 110		~	•	Cladude	_	_	.10.50	-	3
56-83				C 1		Gei	nera	1				9	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	major	20
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									5				3	-
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							her				1	.0	_					

? 1

Course Section: BIOL 420 0101 University of Maryland Page 187 Title ADV TOPICS:CELL BIOLOG Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Title ADV TOPICS:CELL BIOLOG Baltimore County
Instructor: MCGRAW, PATRICI Fall 2006

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	3	0	3	6	3.77	1329/1666	3.77	3.85	4.19	4.22	3.77
		uestions reflec			0	0	2	0	2	2	7	3.92	1042/1421	3.92	3.89	4.24	4.38	3.92
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	981/1617	4.08	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.08
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	728/1555	4.08	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.08
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	994/1543	3.92	3.75	4.06	4.18	3.92
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	learned 0 0 1 0 2 4 6 4.08 728/1555 4.08 3.75 4.00 4.08 at learned 0 0 0 1 5 1 6 3.92 994/1543 3.92 3.75 4.06 4.18 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 8 4.46 549/1647 4.46 3.80 4.12 4.14 1 0 0 5 5 2 0 2.75 1658/1668 2.75 4.80 4.67 4.70 activeness 4 0 2 1 1 3 2 3.22 1464/1605 3.22 3.67 4.07 4.16 0 0 1 1 4 4 3 3.54 1383/1514 3.54 4.24 4.39 4.45 activeness 0 0 0 1 2 5 5 4.08 1030/1503 4.08 3.95 4.24 4.27 activeness 0 0 1 0 3 3 6 4.00 1069/1506 4.00 3.93 4.26 4.29 activeness 0 0 1 1 3 5 3 3.62 882/1311 3.62 3.83 3.85 3.88	4.46												
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	5	5	2	0	2.75	1658/1668	2.75	4.80	4.67	4.70	2.75
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1464/1605	3.22	3.67	4.07	4.16	3.22
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1383/1514	3.54	4.24	4.39	4.45	3.54
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	677/1551	4.85	4.46	4.66	4.73	4.85
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1030/1503	4.08	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.00
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	882/1311	3.62	3.83	3 4.26 4.29		3.62
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	692/1490	4.25	3.66	4.05	4.26	4.25
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1502	4.50	3.86	4.26	4.46	4.50
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	434/1489	4.75	3.85	4.29	4.52	4.75
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	3.90	4.00	4.21	4.75
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	:
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3				_				_	_	_	_			_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Gei	nera	Τ				3	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0											,			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 1								_	respons	es to k	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					8						

?

2

Course Section: BIOL 426 0101

Title APPR TO MOLECULAR BIOL

Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 188 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	199/1669	4.82	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	10	8		1042/1666	4.09	3.85	4.19	4.22	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	8	10	4.09	935/1421	4.09	3.89	4.24	4.38	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	3	1	7	5	3.71	1279/1617	3.71	3.83	4.15	4.22	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	453/1555	4.38	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	1	5	4	2	3.21	1355/1543	3.21	3.75	4.06	4.18	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	5	7	6	3.67	1321/1647	3.67	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	6	9	3	3.74	1225/1605	3.74	3.67	4.07	4.16	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	1022/1514	4.33	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.46	4.66	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	5	8	6	3.90	1168/1503	3.90	3.95	4.24	4.27	3.90
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		0	1	0	4	5	11	4.19	958/1506	4.19	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	3	1	6	3	1	2.86	1173/1311	2.86	3.83	3.85	3.88	2.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	604/1490	4.35	3.66	4.05	4.26	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	256/1502	4.88	3.86	4.26	4.46	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	553/1489	4.65	3.85	4.29	4.52	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	6	13	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.21	***
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	***
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 46		****	4.45	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Ρ

I

0

0

Course Section: BIOL 430 0101 Page 189 BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY JAN 18, 2007 BUSTOS, MAURICI Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	43			
Questionnaires:	38	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Gener	 al															
1. Di	id vou gai:	n new insights,sk		om this course	1	0	0	1	3	11	22	4.46	662/1669	4.46	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.46
		tructor make clea			2	0	0	5	3	13	15	4.06	1065/1666	4.06	3.85	4.19	4.22	4.06
		m questions refle			1	0	0	4	3	10	20	4.24	822/1421	4.24	3.89	4.24	4.38	4.24
		valuations reflec			1	0	2	4	4	12	15	3.92	1154/1617	3.92	3.83	4.15	4.22	3.92
5. Di	id assigne	d readings contri	bute to	what you learned	1	1	3	1	5	9	18	4.06	741/1555	4.06	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.06
6. Di	id written	assignments cont	ribute :	to what you learned	1	0	4	6	9	10	8	3.32	1325/1543	3.32	3.75	4.06	4.18	3.32
7. Wa	as the gra	ding system clear	ly expla	ained -	1	0	1	2	1	11	22	4.38	697/1647	4.38	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.38
8. Ho	ow many ti	mes was class can	celled		1	0	0	0	0	14	23	4.62	1106/1668	4.62	4.80	4.67	4.70	4.62
9. Ho	ow would y	ou grade the over	all tea	ching effectiveness	6	1	1	2	7	8	13	3.97	987/1605	3.97	3.67	4.07	4.16	3.97
		Lectu	re															
1. We	ere the in	prepared	2	0	0	2	0	11	23	4.53	775/1514	4.53	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.53		
2. Di	id the ins	in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	30	4.81	788/1551	4.81	4.46	4.66	4.73	4.81		
3. Wa	as lecture	material present	ed and	explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	11	20	4.33	800/1503	4.33	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.33
4. Di	id the lec	tures contribute	to what	you learned	2	0	0	1	2	9	24	4.56	594/1506	4.56	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.56
5. Di	id audiovi	sual techniques e	nhance :	your understanding	2	1	1	1	3	5	25	4.49	277/1311	4.49	3.83	3.85	3.88	4.49
		Discu	ssion															
1. Di	id class d	iscussions contri	bute to	what you learned	23	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	684/1490	4.27	3.66	4.05	4.26	4.27
2. We	ere all st	udents actively e	ncourage	ed to participate	23	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	415/1502	4.73	3.86	4.26	4.46	4.73
3. Di	id the ins	tructor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	596/1489	4.60	3.85	4.29	4.52	4.60
4. We	ere specia	l techniques succ	essful	-	24	1	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	360/1006	4.31	3.90	4.00	4.21	4.31
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credi	its Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;		
00-2 28-5		0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 18 B 16		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	3	Majo	r	22
56-8		2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General					3	Under-q	rad 3	35	Non-	major	16		
84-1		3.00-3.49	14	D 0		061	c. a.	-				5	onaci -g.	Luu J		14011		10
Grad		3.50-4.00	9	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enone	rh
0_0		3.33 1.00	-									_					·	

Other

28

responses to be significant

Course Section: BIOL 442 0101 University of Maryland Title DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY Baltimore County

BIEBERICH, CHAR (Instr. A)

Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 190

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	230
	0.0

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 97 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I

?

0

	Questions						Fr	-	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did	vou gain ne	ew insights,sk	ills fro	m this course	1	0	3	2	11	28	52	4.29	864/1669	4.29	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.29
		ctor make clea:			1	0	2	4	17	44	29	3.98	1136/1666	3.98	3.85	4.19	4.22	3.98
3. Did	the exam qu	uestions refle	ct the e	xpected goals	1	0	2	7	21	42	24	3.82	1106/1421	3.82	3.89	4.24	4.38	3.82
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	3	79	2	2	2	5	4	3.47	****/1617	****	3.83	4.15	4.22	****
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contril	oute to	what you learned	2	2	13	6	20	26	28	3.54	1212/1555	3.54	3.75	4.00	4.08	3.54
		_		o what you learned	1	86	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	4.18	****
7. Was	the grading	g system clear:	ly expla	ined	4	1	5	13	14	26	34	3.77	1265/1647	3.77	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.77
	-	was class can			3	2	0	0	0	3	89	4.97			4.80	4.67	4.70	4.97
9. How v	would you	grade the over	all teac	hing effectiveness	14	0	0	0	20	46	17	3.96	987/1605	3.96	3.67	4.07	4.16	3.96
		T																
1 Wome	the instan	Lectu: actor's lecture		nwanawad	2	0	1	1	1	26	62	1 57	727/1514	4 E0	1 21	1 20	1 1E	4 E0
		ctor's lecture			2	0	1	0	1	26 12	63 81	4.57 4.81	760/1551	4.50 4.79	4.24	4.39	4.45 4.73	4.50 4.79
				xplained clearly	2	0	2	0	16	41	36	4.01	978/1503		3.95	4.24	4.73	4.79
		es contribute			2	0	2	1	6	27	58	4.13	731/1506		3.93	4.24	4.27	4.34
				our understanding	4		6	5	20	21	30	3.78	774/1311		3.83	3.85	3.88	3.82
J. DIG (addiovibaa.	r ccciniiques ci	mance y	our unacrocanaring	-		O	,	20	21	30	3.70	//1/1511	3.02	3.03	3.03	3.00	3.02
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contril	oute to	what you learned	72	0	5	2	9	5	4	3.04	1323/1490	3.04	3.66	4.05	4.26	3.04
2. Were	all stude	nts actively e	ncourage	d to participate	72	0	4	2	6	5	8	3.44	1323/1502	3.44	3.86	4.26	4.46	3.44
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	72	0	1	3	7	6	8	3.68	1218/1489	3.68	3.85	4.29	4.52	3.68
4. Were	special te	echniques succ	essful		71	17	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.21	****
				Frequ	onat	. Dia	+ nih	+ i o	n									
				riequ	lency	DIS	CLIL	ucio	111									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 24		Re	auir	ed f	or M	aior	 s	1	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	r r	85
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 30						,	-			-	-			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	7	C 18		Ge	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 9	94	Non-	major	12
84-150	51	3.00-3.49	31	D 0													-	
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	21	F 0		El	ecti	ves				3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
											_	_						

Other

82

Course Section: BIOL 442 0101 University of Maryland Title DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY

Baltimore County

Instructor: Eisenmann (Instr. B) Enrollment: 230

Questionnaires: 97

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 191 JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

				Fr	eque	ncie	:S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain ne	ew insights,skills fro	om this course	1	0	3	2	11	28	52	4.29	864/1669	4.29	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instru	ctor make clear the ex	xpected goals	1	0	2	4	17	44	29	3.98	1136/1666	3.98	3.85	4.19	4.22	3.98
3. Did the exam q	uestions reflect the e	expected goals	1	0	2	7	21	42	24	3.82	1106/1421	3.82	3.89	4.24	4.38	3.82
4. Did other evalu	uations reflect the ex	xpected goals	3	79	2	2	2	5	4	3.47	****/1617	****	3.83	4.15	4.22	****
5. Did assigned re	eadings contribute to	what you learned	2	2	13	6	20	26	28	3.54	1212/1555	3.54	3.75	4.00	4.08	3.54
6. Did written as:	signments contribute	to what you learned	1	86	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	****/1543	***	3.75	4.06	4.18	****
7. Was the grading	g system clearly expla	ained	4	1	5	13	14	26	34	3.77	1265/1647	3.77	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.77
8. How many times	was class cancelled		3	2	0	0	0	3	89	4.97	285/1668	4.97	4.80	4.67	4.70	4.97
9. How would you	grade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	22	40	18	3.95	1005/1605	3.96	3.67	4.07	4.16	3.96
	Lecture															
1. Were the instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	12	0	1	2	10	18	54	4.44	908/1514	4.50	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instru	ctor seem interested :	in the subject	11	0	1	0	2	11	72	4.78	843/1551	4.79	4.46	4.66	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture mat	terial presented and e	explained clearly	11	0	2	4	18	32	30	3.98	1096/1503	4.06	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.06
	es contribute to what		11	0	4	1	10	26	45	4.24	917/1506	4.34	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.34
5. Did audiovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	15	8	3	2	25	17	27	3.85	731/1311	3.82	3.83	3.85	3.88	3.82
	Discussion															
1. Did class disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	72	0	5	2	9	5	4	3.04	1323/1490	3.04	3.66	4.05	4.26	3.04
	nts actively encourage	-	72	0	4	2	6	5	8		1323/1502		3.86	4.26	4.46	3.44
	ctor encourage fair a		72	0	1	3	7	6	8	3.68	1218/1489	3.68	3.85	4.29	4.52	3.68
	echniques successful		71	17	1	1	4	1	2		****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.21	***
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	s
00-27 1	0.00-0.99 1	 A 24		 Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 Iajor	 s	1	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 or	85
20 55 0	1 00 1 00 0	D 20			-			-						,		

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	24	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	3	Major	85
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	30						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	7	С	18	General	2	Under-grad	94	Non-major	12
84-150	51	3.00-3.49	31	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	21	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	82				
				?	7						

Course Section: BIOL 453 0101 University of Maryland Page 192 Title PHYSIOL BASES OF BEHAV Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1001/1669	4.18	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.18
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1409/1666	3.64	3.85	4.19	4.22	3.64
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	935/1421	4.09	3.89	4.24	4.38	4.09
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	875/1617	4.18	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.18
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	398/1555	4.44	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.44
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	453/1543	4.45	3.75	4.06	4.18	4.45
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1489/1647	3.30	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.30
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1232/1668	4.45	4.80	4.67	4.70	4.45
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1464/1605	3.22	3.67	4.07	4.16	3.22
		Lectur	_															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	3	4 20	1118/1514	4.20	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.20
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	1	0	1	8		1111/1551		4.46	4.66	4.73	4.60
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	4		1015/1503	4.10	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.10
		es contribute t			1	0	1	1	2	4	2		1319/1506	3.50	3.93	4.26	4.29	3.50
				our understanding	1	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	818/1311	3.70	3.83	3.85	3.88	3.70
		Discus																
1 വർ പ				what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	742/1490	4.20	3.66	4.05	4.26	4.20
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.20	336/1502	4.20	3.86	4.05	4.46	4.20
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	800/1489	4.40	3.85	4.29	4.52	4.40
		echniques succe		d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.40	199/1006		3.90	4.29	4.21	4.40
4. were s	pecial te	echniques succe	SSIUI		ь	U	U	U	U	2	3	4.60	199/1006	4.60	3.90	4.00	4.21	4.60
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	 0.00-0.99	0	 A 5					or Ma			0	Graduat		1	Majo		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	А 5 В 4		кес	quir	eu I	OT Mg	ajors	>	U	Graduati	=	Т	мајс	ıΤ	8
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Cos	nera	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non	major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		Gei	iiei a	_				U	onder -g.	Lau I	. 0	MOII-	iia jui	٥
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		E14	ecti [.]					0	#### - 1	Maana t	here s	re not	- 220110	rh
Grau.	т	3.30-4.00	U	P 0		11.11.5	CCLI	v C D				U	respons				_	1++
				I 0		O+1	her					4	T CPFOILP	LD LU L	c argi.	ııııcaı		
				<u> </u>		ULI	TICT					T						

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2006

Page 193

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 23 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course Section: BIOL 476 0101

ANTIBOTICS

LOVETT, PAUL S

Title

Instructor:

		Ouestion	-		MD	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	S 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescion										Mean					Mean	
		Genera	l															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	1	5	2	15	4.35	804/1669		4.05	4.23	4.39	4.35
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	2	4	3	13		1048/1666		3.85	4.19	4.22	4.09
		uestions reflec			1	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	719/1421		3.89	4.24	4.38	4.36
		ations reflect	_		0	0	1	2	4	5	11		1029/1617		3.83	4.15	4.22	4.00
				hat you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	16	4.52	324/1555		3.75	4.00	4.08	4.52
		_		what you learned	1	2	1	4	3	2	10		1101/1543		3.75	4.06	4.18	3.80
		g system clearly		.ned	0	0	0	3	1	3	16	4.39	666/1647		3.80	4.12	4.14	4.39
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91			4.80	4.67	4.70	4.91
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	3	1	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	851/1605	4.11	3.67	4.07	4.16	4.11
		Lecture																
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	3	2	3	15		1052/1514		4.24	4.39	4.45	4.30
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	1	1	21		. ,	4.87	4.46	4.66	4.73	4.87
				plained clearly	0	0	0	4	2	6	11		1045/1503		3.95	4.24	4.27	4.04
		es contribute t	_		0	0	2	3	2	5			1194/1506		3.93	4.26	4.29	3.87
5. Did au	ıdiovisual	l techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	0	6	5	0	3	3	6	3.29	1045/1311	3.29	3.83	3.85	3.88	3.29
		Discus							_	_								
				hat you learned	13	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	956/1490		3.66	4.05	4.26	3.90
				l to participate	13	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	975/1502		3.86	4.26	4.46	4.10
				l open discussion	13	0	0	2	1	3	4		1125/1489		3.85	4.29	4.52	3.90
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	sstul		13	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.21	****
		Labora	cory															
				round information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.05	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were n	ecessary	materials avai	lable fo	or lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.52	4.50	4.39	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	A 7					or Ma			1	 Graduat		2	Majo		8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10		r.ec	darr.	=u L(J⊥ I⁴lc	י זטני	D	_	Graduat	C	4	Ma JC	, <u> </u>	O
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Cer	nera:	1				7	Under-g	rad ?	21	Non-	-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D 0		Gel	ııcı d.	_				,	onder-9	rau 2		11011-	ila JUI	10
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		וק.	ectiv	760				2	#### - :	Meane +	here a	re not	enous	rh
grau.	2	3.30-4.00	4	P 0		11.1	CCLI	vca				4	respons				_	111
				I O		∩+1	her					7	T CPPOIIS	-5 -C L	~ pran	LLLCal		
				? 1		001						,						
				; ±														

Course Section: BIOL 483 0101

Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES

Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 25

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 194 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions				eque					ructor		_	UMBC		
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	3	22	4.88	143/1669	4.88	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	527/1666	4.52	3.85	4.19	4.22	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	217/1421		3.89	4.24	4.38	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	347/1617	4.64	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2		17	4.60	262/1555	4.60	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	316/1543	4.58	3.75	4.06	4.18	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	515/1647	4.48	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	6	12		239/1605		3.67		4.16	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	170/1514	4.94	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	556/1503	4.50	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	299/1506	4.79	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	0	5	17	4.54	246/1311	4.68	3.83	3.85	3.88	4.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	340/1490	4.67	3.66	4.05	4.26	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	119/1502	4.95	3.86	4.26	4.46	4.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	378/1489	4.80	3.85	4.29	4.52	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	6	14	4.52	227/1006	4.52	3.90	4.00	4.21	4.52
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	92/ 226	4.44	4.19	4.20	4.61	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	169/ 233	3.89	4.05	4.19	4.40	3.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	102/ 225	4.67	4.52	4.50	4.39	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	138/ 223	4.33	4.12	4.35	4.56	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	86/ 206	4.44	3.90	4.15	4.20	4.44
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Farned Cum CDN Expected Crades				D.O.	acon	a			Tan	20			Majorg	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	 А	14	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	3	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	22	Non-major	12
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	1						

Course Section: BIOL 483 0101 University of Maryland

Page 195 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 26

Questionnaires:	25	St.udent.	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mear
	General															
1. Did you gain new ir	sights,skills from	this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	143/1669	4.88	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor	make clear the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	527/1666	4.52	3.85	4.19	4.22	4.52
3. Did the exam questi	ons reflect the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	217/1421	4.80	3.89	4.24	4.38	4.80
4. Did other evaluation	_	_	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	347/1617		3.83	4.15	4.22	4.64
5. Did assigned readir			0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	262/1555		3.75	4.00	4.08	4.60
6. Did written assignm		_	1	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	316/1543		3.75	4.06	4.18	4.58
7. Was the grading sys		ned	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	515/1647		3.80	4.12	4.14	4.48
8. How many times was			0	0	0	0	0	0	25 7	5.00	1/1668		4.80	4.67		5.00
9. How would you grade	the overall teacr	ling effectiveness	15	0	U	U	U	3	7	4.70	210/1605	4.62	3.67	4.07	4.16	4.62
	Lecture															
1. Were the instructor	_	_	13	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1514		4.24	4.39	4.45	4.94
2. Did the instructor			14	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1551		4.46	4.66	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture materia	_		13	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	386/1503		3.95	4.24	4.27	4.50
4. Did the lectures co	_		13	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	249/1506			4.26		4.79
5. Did audiovisual ted	chniques enhance yo	our understanding	13	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	142/1311	4.68	3.83	3.85	3.88	4.68
	Discussion															
1. Did class discussion	ons contribute to w	hat you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	340/1490	4.67	3.66	4.05	4.26	4.67
2. Were all students a	ctively encouraged	l to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	119/1502	4.95	3.86	4.26	4.46	4.95
3. Did the instructor	encourage fair and	l open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	378/1489	4.80	3.85	4.29	4.52	4.80
4. Were special techni	ques successful		4	0	1	0	0	6	14	4.52	227/1006	4.52	3.90	4.00	4.21	4.52
	Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increas	se understanding of	the material	16	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	92/ 226	4.44	4.19	4.20	4.61	4.44
2. Were you provided w	rith adequate backs	round information	16	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	169/ 233	3.89	4.05	4.19	4.40	3.89
3. Were necessary mate	erials available fo	or lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	102/ 225	4.67	4.52	4.50	4.39	4.67
4. Did the lab instruc	_		16	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	138/ 223		4.12	4.35	4.56	4.33
5. Were requirements f	for lab reports cle	early specified	16	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	86/ 206	4.44	3.90	4.15	4.20	4.44
	Seminar															
l. Were assigned topic	s relevant to the	announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****
2. Was the instructor	available for indi	vidual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****
3. Did research projec			23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.48	****
4. Did presentations o		you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 105		5.00	4.20	4.27	****
5. Were criteria for o	rading made clear		23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****
		Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	5
00.07																
	0.00-0.99 2 00-1.99 0	A 14 B 9		Red	quire	ea fo	or Ma	Jor	S	2	Graduat	e	3	Majo	r	13
	2.00-2.99 2	C 0		Ger	nera:	1			1	0	Under-q	rad 2	2	Non-	major	12
	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		001	u.	-				•	onacr 9		-	1,011		
	3.50-4.00 4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ah
		P 0									respons				_	•
		I 0		Oth	ner				1	1			9-		-	
					-											

Course Section: BIOL 483 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 196

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES Instructor: (Instr. C) Fall 2006

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 3 22 4.88 143/1669 4.88 4.05 4.23 4.39 4.88 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 00 2 8 15 4.52 527/1666 4.52 3.85 4.19 4.22 4.52 0 0 5 20 4.80 217/1421 4.80 3.89 4.24 4.38 4.80 0 2 5 18 4.64 347/1617 4.64 3.83 4.15 4.22 4.64 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 6 17 4.60 262/1555 4.60 3.75 4.00 4.08 4.60 0 1 8 15 4.58 316/1543 4.58 3.75 4.06 4.18 4.58 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 3 7 15 4.48 515/1647 4.48 3.80 4.12 4.14 4.48 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 25 5.00 1/1668 5.00 4.80 4.67 4.70 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 0 0 0 2 1 7 4.50 373/1605 4.62 3.67 4.07 4.16 4.62 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 13 0 Ω Ω Ω 1 11 4.92 170/1514 4.94 4.24 4.39 4.45 4.94 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 14 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1551 5.00 4.46 4.66 4.73 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 13 0 0 0 2 4 6 4.33 800/1503 4.50 3.95 4.24 4.27 4.50 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 353/1506 4.79 3.93 4.26 4.29 4.79 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 13 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 142/1311 4.68 3.83 3.85 3.88 4.68 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 2 340/1490 4.67 3.66 4.05 4.26 4.67 3 16 4.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 1 20 4.95 119/1502 4.95 3.86 4.26 4.46 4.95 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 1 2 17 4.80 378/1489 4.80 3.85 4.29 4.52 4.80 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 6 14 4.52 227/1006 4.52 3.90 4.00 4.21 4.52 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 0 0 5 4.44 92/ 226 4.44 4.19 4.20 4.61 4.44 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 1 Ω 1 4 3 3.89 169/233 3.89 4.05 4.19 4.40 3.89 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 102/225 4.67 4.52 4.50 4.39 4.67 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 16 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 138/ 223 4.33 4.12 4.35 4.56 4.33 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 0 0 0 2 1 6 4.44 86/ 206 4.44 3.90 4.15 4.20 4.44 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2 4.33 ****/ 112 **** **** 4.38 4.74 **** 0 1 4.50 ****/ 97 **** 5.00 4.36 4.69 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 4.22 4.48 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0 0 Ω 0 1 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 23 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 ****/ 105 **** 5.00 4.20 4.27 **** 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 23 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 98 **** **** 3.95 3.86 **** Frequency Distribution

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	 А	14	Required for Majors	2	 Graduate	3	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	22	Non-major	12
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enougl	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	1						

Baltimore County

Fall 2006

University of Maryland Page 197 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Course Section: BIOL 611 0101

9

BACTERIAL PHYSIOLOGY

SCHREIER, HAROL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_		4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1332/1669	3.83	4.05	4.23	4.35	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	984/1666	4.17	3.85	4.19	4.19	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	886/1421	4.17	3.89	4.24	4.33	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1207/1617	3.83	3.83	4.15	4.24	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1021/1555	3.80	3.75	4.00	4.07	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	723/1543	4.20	3.75	4.06	4.27	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	948/1647	4.17	3.80	4.12	4.15	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.80	4.67	4.83	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1148/1605	3.83	3.67	4.07	4.13	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.24	4.39	4.37	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	800/1503	4.33	3.95	4.24	4.22	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	838/1506	4.33	3.93	4.26	4.24	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.89	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	622/1490	4.33	3.66	4.05	4.18	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4		0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	3.86	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.67	3.85	4.29	4.44	4.67
Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credita Formed Com CDA Francisco Credea				Do		_			П				Madawa	

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

Course Section: BIOL 620 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV TOPICS: CELL BIOLOG

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: MCGRAW, PATRICI

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

Page 198 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA		-	ncies 3		5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_			
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			1			1		2 50	1648/1669	2 50	4 05	4 22	1 25	2 50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0		0						1660/1666					

General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50 1648/1669	2.50	4.05	4.23	4.35	2.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00 1660/1666	2.00	3.85	4.19	4.19	2.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 1357/1421	3.00	3.89	4.24	4.33	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00 1610/1617	2.00	3.83	4.15	4.24	2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00 1545/1555	2.00	3.75	4.00	4.07	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00 895/1543	4.00	3.75	4.06	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50 1636/1647	1.50	3.80	4.12	4.15	1.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50 1664/1668	2.50	4.80	4.67	4.83	2.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 1501/1605	3.00	3.67	4.07	4.13	3.00
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50 1486/1514	2.50	4.24	4.39	4.37	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50 1489/1551	3.50	4.46	4.66	4.72	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50 1473/1503	2.50	3.95	4.24	4.22	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00 1490/1506	2.00	3.93	4.26	4.24	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 1296/1311	1.00	3.83	3.85	3.89	1.00
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 1328/1490	3.00	3.66	4.05	4.18	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 1501/1502	1.00	3.86	4.26	4.46	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 1489/1489	1.00	3.85	4.29	4.44	1.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00 1005/1006	1.00	3.90	4.00	4.11	1.00
Self Paced													

1 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 42/ 42 2.00 2.00 4.31 4.40 2.00 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal

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

1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 55/ 55 1.00 1.00 4.34 4.45 1.00

Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB

Instructor:

WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

Page 199

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Baltimore County Fall 2006

University of Maryland

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies		Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.05	4.23	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	118/1666	4.89	3.85	4.19	4.19	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1421	4.89	3.89	4.24	4.33	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1617	4.89	3.83	4.15	4.24	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	398/1555	4.44	3.75	4.00	4.07	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	344/1543	4.56	3.75	4.06	4.27	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	194/1647	4.78	3.80	4.12	4.15	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	107/1605	4.61	3.67	4.07	4.13	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1514	4.94	4.24	4.39	4.37	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	144/1503	4.94	3.95	4.24	4.22	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	188/1506	4.94	3.93	4.26	4.24	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	142/1311	4.88	3.83	3.85	3.89	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	155/1490	4.89	3.66	4.05	4.18	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1502	5.00	3.86	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.85	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.11	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 226	5.00	4.19	4.20	4.47	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.05	4.19	4.41	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.52	4.50	4.65	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.12	4.35	4.48	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	3.90	4.15	4.39	5.00
Seminar														
	_	2	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	++++/ 110	****	****	4 20	4 20	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6 5		0	0	0		1 4		****/ 112			4.38	4.39	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	-	0			-	0	_	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.38	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.36	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6 7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.23	5.00 ***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	-7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.93	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.53	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.06	4.57	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.45	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.40	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0			****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
	•	Ü	Ü	J	-	,	_		, 10					

Course Section: BIOL 635L 0101 Title

ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB

Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 199 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006 Page 200 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.05	4.23	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	118/1666	4.89	3.85	4.19	4.19	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1421	4.89	3.89	4.24	4.33	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1617	4.89	3.83	4.15	4.24	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	398/1555	4.44	3.75	4.00	4.07	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	344/1543	4.56	3.75	4.06	4.27	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	194/1647	4.78	3.80	4.12	4.15	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.83	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	591/1605	4.61	3.67	4.07	4.13	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1514	4.94	4.24	4.39	4.37	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	4.94	3.95	4.24	4.22	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	4.94	3.93	4.26	4.24	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1311	4.88	3.83	3.85	3.89	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	155/1490	4.89	3.66	4.05	4.18	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1502	5.00	3.86	4.26	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.85	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.11	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 226	5.00	4.19	4.20	4.47	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.05	4.19	4.41	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	9		1/ 225	5.00		4.50	4.65	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 223	5.00		4.35	4.48	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 206	5.00	3.90	4.15	4.39	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.38	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.36	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 105	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.23	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.93	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.53	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.06	4.57	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.45	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.40	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****
		-	-	-			_		,					

Course Section: BIOL 635L 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB Baltimore County

Instructor: (Instr. B)

9 Enrollment:

Fall 2006

Page 200 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course Section: BIOL 653 0101 University of Maryland Title PHYSIOL BASES OF BEHAV Baltimore County Fall 2006

Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E

Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 201

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4			3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	;		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did voi	u gain ne	General w insights,skil		om this source	0	0	0	Λ	0	2	1	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.05	4.23	4.35	4.33
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.67	3.85	4.19	4.19	4.67
		estions reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.67	3.89	4.24	4.33	4.67
	_	ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	5.00	3.83	4.15	4.24	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1555	4.67	3.75	4.00	4.07	4.67
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.67	3.75	4.06	4.27	4.67
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.80	4.12	4.15	5.00
		was class cance		ainea	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.83	5.00
	-			ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1		591/1605	4.33	3.67	4.07	4.13	4.33
				_														
		Lecture																
		ctor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.24	4.39	4.37	4.67
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	seem interested in the subject					0	0	1	2	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.46	4.66	4.72	4.67
	cture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.67	3.95	4.24	4.22	4.67
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	838/1506	4.33	3.93	4.26	4.24	4.33
5. Did aud	diovisual	. techniques enh	ance	your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	389/1311	4.33	3.83	3.85	3.89	4.33
		- 1																
		Discuss			_					•	_							
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.66	4.05	4.18	5.00
		-	_	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	3.86	4.26	4.46	5.00
		_		nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1489	5.00	3.85	4.29	4.44	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	siul		0	0	U	U	U	1	2	4.67	178/1006	4.67	3.90	4.00	4.11	4.67
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Pe:	asons	2			Туј	26			Majors		
										, 				,c 				,
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduate	е	2	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0															
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	F 0 Electives							1	#### - 1	- Means there are		re not	enoug	ıh

Other

Ρ

I

0

0