Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL

Enrollment: 288 Questionnaires: 206

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 137 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies In			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	5	12	33	63	91		1060/1522		4.29	4.30	4.14	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	10	32	67	92	4.15	976/1522	4.15	4.11	4.26	4.18	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	7	15	21		102	4.15	849/1285	4.15	4.01	4.30	4.22	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	20	4	10	38		69	3.99	1020/1476	3.99	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.99
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	6	5	26		105	4.26	566/1412	4.26	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		57	7	14	33	46	45		1052/1381	3.74	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	14	36		84		956/1500	4.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0		195		146/1517	4.98	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	36	4	3	6	38	84	35	3.86	1073/1497	3.86	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.86
Lecture	_		_		_		0		504/5440					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	4	6		153	4.66	604/1440	4.66	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	0	4		167	4.77	821/1448	4.77	4.64	4.71	4.63	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	11	27	78	82	4.12	995/1436	4.12	4.18	4.29	4.24	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	9	12	21		92	4.10	995/1432	4.10	4.18	4.29	4.23	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	9	5	32	54	97	4.14	540/1221	4.14	4.08	3.93	3.86	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	9	22	24	66	72	3.88	834/1280	3.88	4.09	4.10	3.92	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	5	3	24		108	4.33	751/1277	4.33	4.35	4.34	4.13	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	5	5	32		106	4.25	777/1269	4.25	4.35	4.31	4.04	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	8	9	30	70	74	4.01	424/ 854	4.01	3.94	4.02	3.87	4.01
1. Were bycolar commiques successful		_	O		50	, 0	, -	1.01	121/ 031	1.01	3.71	1.02	3.07	1.01
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	191	7	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.31	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	194	0	2	1	4	1	4	3.33	****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	196	3	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	194	5	2	1	2	2	0	2.57	****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	195	4	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	4.28	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	193	5	0	1	3	2	2		****/ 79	****		4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	195	4	2	2	0	3	0	2.57	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	195	4	2	2	1	1	1		****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	195	2	1	3	1	1	3		****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	196	1	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	3.79	****
mi al di manda														
Field Work	100	0	0	2	2	2	2	2 70	++++/ 17	****	4 05	1 11	2 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	196	0	0	2	2	3	3		****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	197	0	2	1	2	2	2		****/ 45		3.00	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	197	3	0	2	3	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	197 197	2 2	2	3 2	1	1	0		****/ 35 ****/ 34	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	197	2	2	2	U	3	U	2.5/	***/ 34			4.30	4.11	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	193	0	2	3	2	2	4	3.23	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	193	0	2	2	2	3	4		****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	193	3	2	2	3	0	3	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	193	2	1	3	3	1	3	3.18	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	194	2	1	1	1	4	3		****/ 18	****	4.67		4.11	****
5 •														

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL

Enrollment: 288
Questionnaires: 206

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 137 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	\$
00-27	89	0.00-0.99	1	А	99	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	58
28-55	41	1.00-1.99	5	В	65						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	30	C	26	General	1	Under-grad	206	Non-major	148
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	27	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	60	F	1	Electives	5	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	jh
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	174				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR SOKOLOVE, PHIL (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

6

Page 138

responses to be significant

Instructor:	SOKOLOVE,	PHIL	(Instr. A)	Spring 2007
Enrollment:	10			
Questionnaires:	10			Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Overtion	-		Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4					_	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level		
		Questions	5 		NR	NA				4	5 	mean	Kank	Mean	mean	mean	mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vou	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.29	4.30	4.14	4.80
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	824/1522	4.30	4.11	4.26	4.18	4.30
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	405/1285	4.63	4.01	4.30	4.22	4.63
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.09	4.20
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	137/1412	4.80	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.80
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	663/1381	4.20	3.83	4.08	3.93	4.20
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	839/1500	4.20	4.09	4.18	4.16	4.20
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How wor	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	534/1497	4.30	3.96	4.11	4.02	4.30
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were th	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	1	5	4.83	304/1440	4.70	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.70
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.63	5.00
3. Was led	cture mate	erial presented	d and e	explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	793/1436	4.45	4.18	4.29	4.24	4.45
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	what	you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	454/1432	4.62	4.18	4.29	4.23	4.62
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	4	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	213/1221	4.43	4.08	3.93	3.86	4.43
		Discus	ai on															
1 Did ala	oga diagn			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	477/1280	4.40	4.09	4.10	3.92	4.40
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	7		527/1277	4.60	4.35	4.34	4.13	4.60
		-	_	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.35	4.31	4.04	
		chniques succes		a open arbeassion	0	1	0	0	1	6	-	4.11	407/ 854				3.87	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor:	 S	1	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo		3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 4			_			,						3 -		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	0	Non-	major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h

Other

0

0

0

I

?

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101 University of Maryland Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR Baltimore County Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS (Instr. B) Spring 2007

University of Maryland Page 139
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	10			
Questionnaires:	10	Student Cour	rse Evaluation	Questionnaire

I

?

0

0

					Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.29	4.30	4.14	4.80
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	824/1522		4.11	4.26	4.18	4.30
		uestions reflec			0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	405/1285		4.01	4.30	4.22	4.63
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.09	4.20
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	137/1412	4.80	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.80
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	663/1381	4.20	3.83	4.08	3.93	4.20
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	839/1500	4.20	4.09	4.18	4.16	4.20
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	685/1497	4.30	3.96	4.11	4.02	4.30
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	-	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	716/1440	4.70	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.70
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448		4.64	4.71	4.63	5.00
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	1	1	5	4.57	514/1436	4.45	4.18	4.29	4.24	4.45
		es contribute t			3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	558/1432	4.62	4.18	4.29	4.23	4.62
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	461/1221	4.43	4.08	3.93	3.86	4.43
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	477/1280	4.40	4.09	4.10	3.92	4.40
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	527/1277	4.60	4.35	4.34	4.13	4.60
				nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	586/1269	4.50	4.35	4.31	4.04	4.50
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	-	0	1	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	407/ 854	4.11	3.94	4.02	3.87	4.11
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ıtioı	n									
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe 			Majors	}
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1				_	βh
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

6

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 140 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	2	0	2	4	4	2 42	1422/1500	2 42	4 20	4 20	1 11	2 42
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3 1	4	3 2	4 3			1433/1522		4.29	4.30	4.14	3.43 3.36
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	1	4	2		4	2		1415/1522	3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	2.85
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				2	1				1265/1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0		1 2	5	4		1115/1476	3.44		4.22	4.09	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1 0	1 2	0 2	4	4 1	3		892/1412		4.06	4.06 4.08	4.01	3.91 3.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	U	2	2	4	Τ	3	3.08	1281/1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	1	2	1	5	3.55	1283/1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1080/1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	2	2	3	0	1	2.50	1476/1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	2.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	3	6	4 18	1100/1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	1			1258/1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	4	3			1212/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	0	3			1248/1432			4.29	4.23	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	0	3	1			846/1221			3.93		3.64
3. Did addiovisual eccliniques childhee your understanding	3	O	_	O	5	_	5	3.01	010/1221	3.03	1.00	3.75	3.00	3.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	0	0	1		****/1277	1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	3.87	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	183/ 215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22		3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	4.22
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20			4.48	4.51	4.51	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	,		4.41	4.42	4.41	4.10
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	2	3	-		171/ 205					3.78
	_		_	-	_	_	-							
Seminar		_		_	_									
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	2.00	2.00	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	1.50	1.50	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 78	1.00	1.00	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	1.00	1.00	4.11	3.79	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	4.00	4.25	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.90	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
Oals Breed														
Self Paced 1. Did golf paged gyatem centribute to what you learned	1 2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 37	4 00	1 67	1 62	/ E2	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0		0		, -	4.00	4.67	4.63	4.53	****
 Did study questions make clear the expected goal Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 	13 13	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 23 ****/ 33	3.00 ****	3.00	4.41	4.19	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 22	****	5.00 4.67	4.69 4.54	4.57 4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	4.11	***
J. Were there enough procedus for all the students	13	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 10		1.07	1.12	1.11	

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 140 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

23

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 141 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

9

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

					Frequencies				Ins	tructo	r	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rai	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																	
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	2	0	0	1	7	7	5	3.80	1269/	1522	3.43	4.29	4.30	4.14	3.80
		ctor make clear			2	0	1	4	3	6	6		1323/		3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	3.60
		uestions reflec			2	0	5	3	6	1	5	2.90	1264/	1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	2.90
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	2	0	3	3	1	8	5	3.45	1336/	1476	3.44	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.45
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	3	1	0	1	4	5	8	4.11	688/1	1412	3.68	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.11
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ribute to	o what you learned	3	0	2	3	2	5	7	3.63	1113/	1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.63
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	3	0	3	2	1	7	6	3.58	1272/	1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	3.58
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	celled		3	0	0	0	-	11	8	4.42	1144/	1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.42
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	all teacl	hing effectiveness	4	1	1	2	7	5	2	3.29	1358/	1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.29
		Lectur	re																
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	es well j	prepared	2	0	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	1007/	1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.30
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	rested in	n the subject	2	0	0	3	3	5	9	4.00	1353/3	1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	4.00
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	ed and e	xplained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	7	8	4.05	1029/	1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	4.05
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	1	2	5	6	6	3.70	1212/	1432	3.29	4.18	4.29	4.23	3.70
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques er	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	1	9	7	3	3.60	860/3	1221	3.65	4.08	3.93	3.86	3.60
		Discus	ssion																
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/	1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	****	
		_	19	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/		1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	****		
	ere all students actively encouraged to participatid the instructor encourage fair and open discuss:					0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/	1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were s	Were special techniques successful					1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	854	****	3.94	4.02	3.87	****
		Labora	atorv																
1. Did th	ne lab in	crease understa	_	f the material	3	0	2	2	4	4	7	3.63	197/	215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.63
			_	ground information	3	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	174/		3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	4.05
				or lab activities	3	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	175/	217	3.96	4.48	4.51	4.51	4.21
4. Did th	ne lab in	structor provid	de assis	tance	3	1	3	1	4	2	8	3.61	191/	216	3.71	4.41	4.42	4.41	3.61
5. Were r	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	3	0	2	0	2	7	8	4.00	141/	205	3.70	4.30	4.23	4.28	4.00
		Semina	ir																
1. Were a	assigned			announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	79	2.00	2.00	4.58	4.13	****
				ividual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	77	1.50	1.50	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did re	esearch p	rojects contrib	oute to	what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	65	1.00	1.00	4.49	3.85	****
		Field	Work																
3. Was th	ne instru	ctor available		sultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	39	****	****	4.40	3.99	****
				Frequ	iencv	Dist	trib	ution	ı										
					- 2														
Credits E	Earned 	Cum. GP <i>I</i>	·	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3 				Тур	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	2	Grad	duate	9	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 5															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Unde	er-gi	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0					re not	enoug	jh

Other

Ρ

Ι

0

0

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 142 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	9	7	3	3.45	1421/1522	3.43	4.29	4.30	4.14	3.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	3	9	3	3.27	1435/1522	3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	6	9	0	3.00	1248/1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	5	9	3	3.52	1315/1476	3.44	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	3	4	6	7	3.85	932/1412	3.68	4.06	4.06	4.01	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	6	6	4	3.45	1175/1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	4	6	5	4	3.24	1399/1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	3.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1193/1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.37
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	7	2	7	2	1	2.37	1482/1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	2.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	5	6	7	3.90	1252/1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	2	4	4	7	3.63	1414/1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	3.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	6	7	3	3.45	1298/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	8	6	0	2.95	1374/1432	3.29	4.18	4.29	4.23	2.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	2	6	3	5	3.39	963/1221		4.08	3.93	3.86	3.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/1277	1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	****/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	***
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	3.87	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	177/ 215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.94
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	2	3	7	4	3.65	211/ 228	3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	3.65
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	1	5	4	8	3.89	202/ 217	3.96	4.48	4.51	4.51	3.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	2	1	7	7	3.79	185/ 216	3.71	4.41	4.42	4.41	3.79
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	172/ 205	3.70	4.30	4.23	4.28	3.76
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 79	2.00	2.00	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 77	1.50	1.50	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 78	1.00	1.00	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	1.00	1.00	4.11	3.79	****
Field Work	0.1	•	•	-	0	0	0	0 00		4 00	4 05	4 45	2 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	4.00	4.25	4.41	3.90	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.90	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	***	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	4.00	4.67	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 23		3.00	4.41		****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	∠⊥	U	Т	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 23	3.00	3.00	4.41	4.19	

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LAR

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 22

CLAASSEN, LARK Spring 2007

Page 142 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad 2	22	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	here	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to b	oe sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 143 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				-	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1122/1522	3.43	4.29	4.30	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1458/1522	3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1236/1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	1349/1476	3.44	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	430/1412	3.68	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	806/1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1475/1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	2.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1301/1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1204/1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1094/1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1319/1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1315/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1305/1432	3.29	4.18	4.29	4.23	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	860/1221	3.65	4.08	3.93	3.86	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1277	1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	3.87	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	89/ 215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	154/ 228	3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	170/ 217	3.96	4.48	4.51	4.51	4.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	174/ 216		4.41	4.42	4.41	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	108/ 205	3.70	4.30	4.23	4.28	4.25
									,					

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

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Emmallment: CDAASSEN, I

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 144 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equei			_		tructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3 00	1489/1522	3.43	4 29	4.30	4.14	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	1		1365/1522		4.11	4.26	4.18	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	0		1248/1285		4.01		4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	0		1380/1476		4.02	4.22	4.09	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	0		1385/1412		4.06	4.06	4.01	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	0		1350/1381		3.83	4.08	3.93	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	1	0		1481/1500		4.09	4.18	4.16	2.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	•		802/1517		4.73	4.65	4.62	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	1			1370/1497		3.96		4.02	
7. how would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	3		U	3.43	13/0/149/	3.00	3.90	4.11	4.02	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1186/1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1402/1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	3.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1212/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	1414/1432	3.29	4.18	4.29	4.23	2.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	899/1221	3.65	4.08	3.93	3.86	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0		1277/1280		4.09	4.10	3.92	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	0	0		1276/1277		4.35		4.13	1.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	215/ 215	3 74	4.37	4.36	4.31	2.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	1	1		3.50	214/ 228	3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	1	0	0	1				4.48		4.51	2.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	0	0	_	3.00	203/ 216		4.41		4.41	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	1	0	0		2.67	,		4.30	4.23		2.67
3. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	_	Ü	_	_	O	O	_	2.07	2037 203	3.70	1.50	1.25	1.20	2.07
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	79/ 79	2.00	2.00	4.58	4.13	2.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	1	1	0	0		1.50	77/ 77	1.50	1.50	4.52	4.03	1.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	64/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.49	3.85	1.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	78/ 78	1.00	1.00	4.45	3.88	1.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	80/ 80	1.00	1.00	4.11	3.79	1.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 47	4.00	4.25	4.41	3.90	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	40/ 45		3.00			3.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	٦	U	U	U	Τ.	U	U	3.00	10/ 13	3.00	3.00	1.50	3.50	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	31/ 37	4.00	4.67		4.53	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	21/ 23	3.00	3.00	4.41	4.19	3.00
From	ionar	. Dia	+ nih	.,+ i c:	_									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	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	4	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4 .

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 145 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Overtions	MD	NT 70	Fre	eque: 2	ncies	5	5		tructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions	NK.	NA				4		Mean	Rank	Mean	mean	Mean	mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	8	5	4	3.76	1289/1522	3.43	4.29	4.30	4.14	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	6	6	5	3.94	1146/1522	3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	9	7	0	1	2.59	1271/1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	2.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	2	6	6	3	3.59	1289/1476	3.44	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	7	3	6	3.82	956/1412	3.68	4.06	4.06	4.01	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	6	7	3	3.71	1076/1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	2	7	4	2	3.12	1420/1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	3.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1104/1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	10	6	1	3.47	1291/1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	1031/1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	1249/1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1029/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	4.06
A Did the leatures centribute to what were learned	3	0	0	2	3	6	7	4 00	1026/1422	3.29	1 10	4.29	1 22	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3 4	0	0	1	3 4	7	5		1036/1432 659/1221		4.18	3.93	4.23	3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	U	U	Т	4	/	5	3.94	059/1221	3.05	4.08	3.93	3.86	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	3.87	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	4	7	3	3.93	180/ 215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.93
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	5	4	5	4.00	178/ 228	3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	169/ 217	3.96	4.48	4.51	4.51	4.27
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	1	1	5	3	4	3.57	193/ 216	3.71	4.41	4.42	4.41	3.57
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	6	3	5	3.93	161/ 205	3.70	4.30	4.23	4.28	3.93
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	2.00	2.00	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	1.50	1.50	4.52	4.03	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.49	3.85	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	1.00	1.00	4.45	3.88	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	1.00	1.00	4.11	3.79	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	4.00	4.67	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 23	3.00	3.00	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	4.31	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	4.11	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected G	rades	Reasons	Reasons			Majors	
00-27	5 5	0.00-0.99	0	A б		Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 4							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 2		General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0							

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	2	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	12	
				2	1			

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 14

Spring 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 146 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

					Fre	eque	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills from	n this course	0	0	4	2	5	2	1	2.57	1508/1522	3.43	4.29	4.30	4.14	2.57
	or make clear the exp		1	0	5	2	2	3	1	2.46	1510/1522	3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	2.46
3. Did the exam que	estions reflect the ex	spected goals	0	0	4	3	5	1	1	2.43	1274/1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	2.43
4. Did other evalua	ations reflect the exp	pected goals	0	1	4	2	3	1	3	2.77	1447/1476	3.44	4.02	4.22	4.09	2.77
3	dings contribute to w	-	0	0	1	2	4	5	2	3.36	1248/1412	3.68	4.06	4.06	4.01	3.36
	gnments contribute to		0	0	3	6	1	4	0		1359/1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	2.43
	system clearly explan	ined	0	0	0	5	1	5	3		1345/1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	3.43
8. How many times w			0	0	0	0	0	6	8		1019/1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.57
9. How would you gr	rade the overall teach	ning effectiveness	1	0	2	1	8	1	1	2.85	1445/1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	2.85
1	Lecture		1	0	1	1	1	1	0	4 00	1062/1440	4 1 17	1 11	4 45	4 40	4 00
	ctor's lectures well p cor seem interested in	_	1	0	1	1	3	1	9		1063/1440 1353/1448	4.17 4.06	4.44	4.45 4.71	4.40	4.23
		_	1	0	1	1	3 6	4	3		1353/1448		4.04	4.71	4.63 4.24	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned			1 1	0	2	2	6	2	1		1320/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	2.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding			2	0	1	1	2	5	3		832/1221	3.65	4.08	3.93	3.86	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				U			4	5	3	3.07	032/1221	3.03	4.00	3.93	3.00	3.07
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	ssions contribute to v	what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all student	s actively encouraged	d to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair and	d open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	***
4. Were special tec	chniques successful		13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	3.87	****
	Laboratory															
	rease understanding of		3	0	2	1	2	2	4	3.45	204/ 215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	3.45
	ed with adequate backs	-	3	0	0	3	1	3	4	3.73	206/ 228	3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	3.73
	naterials available fo		2	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	200/ 217	3.96	4.48	4.51	4.51	3.92
	ructor provide assist		2	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	186/ 216	3.71	4.41	4.42		3.75
5. Were requirement	s for lab reports cle	early specified	3	0	0	3	3	2	3	3.45	188/ 205	3.70	4.30	4.23	4.28	3.45
		Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				P.C.	asons	a .			Ту	20			Majors	
CIECILS Failled	Cuiii. GPA	Expected Grades				ĸe:	asons	5			I Y.	ħΕ			ma Jors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	0						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 147
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fro	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	4	5	6		1444/1522	3.43	4.29	4.30	4.14	3.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	6	6		1319/1522	3.37	4.11	4.26	4.18	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	6	3	4		1244/1285	2.88	4.01	4.30	4.22	3.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	9	4		1251/1476	3.44	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	6	2	4	7		1165/1412	3.68	4.06	4.06	4.01	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	3	5	6		1136/1381	3.30	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	7	2	5	3		1430/1500	3.07	4.09	4.18	4.16	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	10	9		1161/1517	4.46	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	2	4	10	0	3.22	1379/1497	3.08	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	3	12	4.30	1007/1440	4.17	4.44	4.45	4.40	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	4	4	11	4.14	1332/1448	4.06	4.64	4.71	4.63	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	4	4	4	8	3.80	1197/1436	3.71	4.18	4.29	4.24	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	4	3	8	3.60	1243/1432	3.29	4.18	4.29	4.23	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	1	2	3	10	3.84	733/1221	3.65	4.08	3.93	3.86	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	1	0	0	2 00	****/1280	1.00	4.09	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/1277	1.00	4.35	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	3.87	****
I here special coolingach bacoessian		_	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	2.00	, 331		3.71	1.02	3.07	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	162/ 215	3.74	4.37	4.36	4.31	4.06
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	202/ 228	3.90	4.47	4.35	4.33	3.81
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	162/ 217	3.96	4.48	4.51	4.51	4.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	184/ 216	3.71	4.41	4.42	4.41	3.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	173/ 205	3.70	4.30	4.23	4.28	3.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	2.00	2.00	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	1.50	1.50	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	1.00	1.00	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 78	1.00	1.00	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 80	1.00	1.00	4.11	3.79	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 47	4.00	4.25	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 45	3.00	3.00	4.41	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	3.00 ****	3.00 ****	4.30	3.90	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 35	****	****	4.40	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 34	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out fretu accivities	20	U	U	J	U	Τ.	U	Ŧ.UU	/ 34			T.30	4.11	
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected (Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А :	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C :	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D (0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	4	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 10 ? 1

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Spring 2007

Page 148

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Course-Section: BIOL 123 0101

36

HUMAN GENETICS

GLASER, FREDA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 22

	Questions						Fre	_	ncies	3	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
						NA												
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	1171/1522	3.95	4.29	4.30	4.14	3.95
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	2	0	4	6	9	3.95	1135/1522	3.95	4.11	4.26	4.18	3.95
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflect	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	2	1	2	8	8	3.90	1027/1285	3.90	4.01	4.30	4.22	3.90
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	1	2	6	7	5	3.62	1275/1476	3.62	4.02	4.22	4.09	3.62
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	3	1	3	6	6	2	3.28	1281/1412	3.28	4.06	4.06	4.01	3.28
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	0	2	1	6	5	6	3.60	1130/1381	3.60	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.60
		g system clearly		ined	1	0	2	1	2	9	7		1117/1500		4.09	4.18	4.16	3.86
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	1019/1517	4.57	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.57
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	1	1	1	6	4	3	3.47	1296/1497	3.47	3.96	4.11	4.02	3.47
		Lecture		1	-	0	-	•	-	0		4 22	004/1440	4 22		4 45	4 40	4 22
		uctor's lectures			1	-	1	0	Τ	8	11	4.33	,		4.44	4.45	4.40	4.33
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clear]					0	0	0	2	5	14		1097/1448		4.64	4.71	4.63	4.57
	as lecture material presented and explained clearled the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1 1	1 1	4	7 5	8 11		1107/1436		4.18	4.29	4.24	3.95
	rid the lectures contribute to what you learned rid audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi:					-	2	U T	3	_			963/1432		4.18	4.29	4.23	4.14
5. Did au	.diovisua.	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	2	U	2	U	2	7	9	4.05	589/1221	4.05	4.08	3.93	3.86	4.05
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	ace dieci			what you learned	8	0	1	1	4	5	3	3 57	1000/1280	3.57	4.09	4.10	3.92	3.57
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	781/1277	4.29	4.35	4.34	4.13	4.29
		_	_	d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	707/1269	4.36	4.35	4.31	4.04	
		echniques succes		a open arseassion	8	1	0	2	3	3	-	3.85	551/ 854		3.94	4.02	3.87	
1. Were b	peciai e	comingues bucce.	SDIGI		O	_	J	-	3	3		3.03	331, 031	3.03	3.71	1.02	3.07	3.03
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;		
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						quir	ed fo	or Ma		 s 1		Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55							_			-						_		
56-83	-83 1 2.00-2.99 2 C 7					Ge	nera	l				2	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 2														
Grad.							ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ıh
	Р 0												respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0					Ot]	her					1						
	I 0 ? 1																	

Course-Section: BIOL 233 0101 Title

NUTRITION AND HEALTH

Instructor: WELCH, G.

Enrollment: 74 Questionnaires: 65 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 149 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	8	21	32	4.25	899/1522	4.25	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	15	13	30	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	5	12	18	27	3.98	955/1285	3.98	4.01	4.30	4.36	3.98
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	41	1	2	3	6	11	4.04	987/1476	4.04	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	0	10	11	38	4.31	520/1412	4.31	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	48	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	****/1381	****	3.83	4.08	3.97	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	7	14	38	4.31	720/1500	4.31	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	38	24	4.39	1177/1517	4.39	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	4	15	31	8	3.74	1153/1497	3.74	3.96	4.11	4.11	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	5	7	18	31		1071/1440	4.23	4.44	4.45		4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	8	50	4.77	821/1448	4.77	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	4	8	16	32	4.21	916/1436	4.21	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	5	7	12	35	4.20	928/1432	4.20	4.18	4.29		4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	41	5	1	5	3	3	2.88	1110/1221	2.88	4.08	3.93	4.02	2.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	3	0	5	4	9	3.76	900/1280	3.76	4.09	4.10	4.08	3.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	1	1	2	2	16	4.41	692/1277	4.41	4.35	4.34	4.33	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	763/1269	4.27	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	43	17	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	63	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	64	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	64	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51		****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	64	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.72	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	***

Course-Section: BIOL 233 0101

Title NUTRITION AND HEALTH

Instructor: WELCH, G.

Enrollment: 74
Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 149 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	30						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	7	Under-grad	65	Non-major	57
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	16	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enougl	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	47				
				?	1						

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES

Enrollment:

114 Questionnaires: 88 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 150 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	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	2	0	_	0.0	1 00	204/1522	4 0 6	4 20	4 20	1 21	1 00
 Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 	0	0	0	2 2	0 2	6 20	80 64	4.86	204/1522	4.86	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.86 4.66
• •			-					4.66	371/1522	4.66	4.11	4.26	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	28	55	4.55	488/1285	4.55	4.01	4.30		4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	54 5	2 1	0	1 6	6 19	25	4.53	454/1476	4.53	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	Τ	U	ь	19	57	4.58	299/1412	4.58	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	62	0	1	1	6	18	4.58	272/1381	4.58	3.83	4.08	3.97	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	11	72	4.73	242/1500	4.73	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	6	79	4.91		4.91	4.73	4.65		4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	4	21		4.58	326/1497				4.11	
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,	O	_	U	-	21	23	1.50	320/149/	1.50	3.90	T.11	7.11	1.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	12	72	4.78	392/1440	4.78	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	4	82	4.92	444/1448	4.92	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	2	21	59	4.60	478/1436	4.60	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	7		4.82			4.18	4.29	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	30	3	4	2	14	30		493/1221		4.08	3.93		4.21
o. Dia addio.ibdai ocomiiquob cimanoc jour anaciboanaing		50		-	_		50		1707 1221		1.00	3.75	1.02	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	2	1	1	4	13	4.19	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.08	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	2	0	0	3	16	4.48	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.33	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	68	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	68	16	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	81	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	81	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	81	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	81	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.72	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	81	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	87	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	86	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	***
-1 11 ··· 1														
Field Work	0.17	0	0	_	•	•	-	F 00		****	4 05	4 41	4 00	***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	87	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	87	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	87	0	U	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34			4.30	4.17	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	87	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	87	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	87	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	87	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****
J. HOLD CHOLD CHOUSE PLOCEOLD FOR ALL CHE DEMACHED	0,	J	3	5	5	_	U	1.00	, 10		1.07	1.17		

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES

Enrollment: 114
Questionnaires: 88

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 150 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	29	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	39						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	7	Under-grad	88	Non-major	78
84-150	26	3.00-3.49	25	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	67				
				?	5						

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 151 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			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	22	5.00	1/1522	4.73	4.29	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	157/1522	4.61	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	181/1285	4.33	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	597/1476	4.02	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	155/1412	4.59	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	6	9	3.95	872/1381	3.05	3.83	4.08	3.97	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	154/1500	4.73	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	577/1517	4.68	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	129/1497	4.40	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	192/1440	4.39	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1448	4.95	4.64	4.71	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	263/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1432	4.69	4.18	4.29	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	156/1221	3.56	4.08	3.93	4.02	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	677/1280	3.56	4.09	4.10	4.08	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	470/1277	4.33	4.35	4.34	4.33	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	547/1269	3.78	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	426/ 854	2.50	3.94	4.02	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	42/ 215	4.70	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	34/ 228	4.91	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.81
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	24/ 217	4.48	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.94
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	45/ 216	4.74	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	7	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	22/ 205	4.78	4.30	4.23	4.37	4.89
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	***	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor: Questionnaires: 22

Enrollment:

22

Baltimore County FLEISCHMANN, ES Spring 2007

Page 151 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0201 University of Maryland Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 1

Page 152 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

					ncies				ructor	Course			Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	1100/1500	4 72	4 00	4 20	4 24	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1122/1522 1080/1522	4.73 4.61	4.29 4.11	4.30 4.26	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		1248/1285	4.33	4.01	4.30	4.36	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0		1467/1476	4.02	4.02	4.22	4.20	2.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	760/1412	4.59	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0		1370/1381	3.05	3.83	4.08	3.97	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		988/1500	4.73	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1389/1517			4.65		4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		1404/1440	4.39	4.44	4.45	4.42	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	4.95	4.64	4.71	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1056/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1036/1432	4.69	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1197/1221	3.56	4.08	3.93	4.02	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1187/1280	3.56	4.09	4.10	4.08	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	930/1277	4.33	4.35	4.34	4.33	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		1207/1269	3.78	4.35	4.31	4.33	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	854/ 854				4.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	168/ 215	4.70	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 228	4.91	4.47	4.35	4.56	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	211/ 217	4.48	4.48	4.51	4.57	3.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	174/ 216	4.74	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtioı	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
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	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				Т	0	Other	1				
				?	0	0 01101	_				

ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Title

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 153 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	;		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	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	246/1522	4.73	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	255/1522	4.61	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	425/1285	4.33	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	473/1476	4.02	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	231/1412	4.59	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	4	4	5	1	2.94	1307/1381	3.05	3.83	4.08	3.97	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	65/1500	4.73	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	767/1517	4.68	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	272/1497	4.40	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	492/1440	4.39	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	602/1448	4.95	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	415/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	502/1432		4.18	4.29	4.31	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	11	1	0	1	0	1		****/1221	3.56	4.08	3.93	4.02	****
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	,	11	1	U	1	U	1	3.00	/1221	3.50	4.00	3.93	4.02	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	4		****/1280	3.56	4.09	4.10	4.08	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	5		****/1277	4.33	4.35	4.34	4.33	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	5		****/1269	3.78	4.35	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	2.50	3.94	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	41/ 215	4.70	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	29/ 228	4.91	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	0		4.75	71/ 217	4.48	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	43/ 216	4.74	4.41	4.42		4.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	8	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	46/ 205	4.78		4.23	4.37	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	10	_	U	U	U	1		4.50	/ 80		1.00	4.11	4.00	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	***	****	4.30	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	***	***
3 •														

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 21 Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 153 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
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	16				
				?	0						

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 21

Spring 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 154 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	246/1522	4.73	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	255/1522		4.11	4.26	4.29	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	425/1285		4.01	4.30	4.36	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	473/1476		4.02	4.22	4.20	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	231/1412		4.06	4.06	4.00	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	4	4	5	1		1307/1381		3.83	4.08	3.97	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	65/1500		4.09	4.18	4.20	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	767/1517		4.73	4.65	4.63	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	859/1497		3.96	4.11		4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	272/1440	4.39	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	395/1448	4.95	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	170/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	129/1432	4.69	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	10	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1221	3.56	4.08	3.93	4.02	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	4		****/1280		4.09	4.10	4.08	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1277	4.33	4.35	4.34	4.33	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	5		****/1269		4.35	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 854	2.50	3.94	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	41/ 215	4.70	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	29/ 228	4.91	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	71/ 217	4.48	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	43/ 216	4.74	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	8	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	46/ 205	4.78	4.30	4.23	4.37	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 22		4.67	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 21 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 154 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	12	Required for Majors	U	Graduate	O	Major	_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

IOL 252L 0301 University of Maryland

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor:
Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 21

(Instr. C) Spri

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 155

JUN 26, 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	1	0	0	1	0		18	4.80	246/1522	4.73	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	255/1522	4.61	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	425/1285	4.33	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	473/1476	4.02	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	231/1412	4.59	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	4	4	5	1	2.94	1307/1381	3.05	3.83	4.08	3.97	2.94
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	3	0	0	0	0		17	4.94	65/1500	4.73	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	2		4.78	767/1517		4.73	4.65	4.63	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	5	5	2	3.43	1315/1497	4.40	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.05
T a shows														
Lecture	0	0	1	0	2	2	_	4 00	1155/1440	4 20	1 11	4 45	4 40	4 50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	2	3	6		1155/1440		4.44	4.45	4.42	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.95	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9 9	0	0	1 1	1	2	8 9	4.42	708/1436		4.18	4.29	4.29	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		0	-		-	_	-	4.58	548/1432	4.69	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.71 ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	9	0	0	1	0	Ü	3.00	****/1221	3.56	4.08	3.93	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1280	3.56	4.09	4.10	4.08	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	5		****/1277	4.33	4.35	4.34	4.33	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	5		****/1269	3.78	4.35	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 854		3.94	4.02	4.00	****
1. Note Special Committees Successful		J	ŭ	Ü	_	Ū	_	1.00	, 001	2.50	3.71	1.02	1.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	41/ 215	4.70	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.82
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	29/ 228	4.91	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	71/ 217	4.48	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	43/ 216	4.74	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	8	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	46/ 205	4.78	4.30	4.23	4.37	4.67
Seminar		_			_	_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 E0	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	1		,	****	3.00			****
		0	0	0			_	4.50		****	****	4.30	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19		-		0	1	1	4.50	,	****	****	4.40	4.75	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	1	-	_		****/ 35	****		4.31	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	U	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34		****	4.30	4.17	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	_		****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	-	-	-			-			,		-	-		

ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Title Instructor:

(Instr. C)

Page 155 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Credits E	dits Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0401 Universitie ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 156 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

	1 TD	377		_	ncies		-		ructor	Course	_			
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	15	5.00	1/1522	4.73	4.29	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	511/1522	4.61	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	706/1285	4.33	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	838/1476	4.02	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	149/1412	4.59	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	8	1	3.53	1145/1381	3.05	3.83	4.08	3.97	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	252/1500	4.73	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	577/1517		4.73	4.65	4.63	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1497	4.40	3.96	4.11	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	Λ	11	4.75	452/1440	4.39	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1448	4.95	4.64	4.71	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	295/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1432		4.18	4.29	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	606/1221		4.08	3.93		4.00
5. Fix duals, ibual seemilfueb emanee four underseamaring		-	_	ŭ	_	_	-	1.00	000, 1221	3.30	1.00	3.75	1.02	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1280	3.56	4.09	4.10	4.08	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	4.33	4.35	4.34	4.33	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1269		4.35	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 854	2.50	3.94	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	31/ 215	4.70	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.90
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	10		1/ 228	4.91	4.47	4.35	4.56	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	85/ 217	4.48	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	40/ 216	4.74	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.90
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 205		4.30		4.37	5.00
	_	_	-	-	-	-	-		,					
From	onar	Diat	- rih	+ 100	,									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-			
				?	1						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: BIOL 275 0101

188

MICROBIOLOGY

SANDOZ, JAMES W

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 96

University of Maryland Page 157 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestions	Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4						5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General														
	new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	2	12	30	47	4.30	849/1522		4.29	4.30	4.34	4.30
	nctor make clear the expected goals questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	5 6	30 22	28 32	27 29		1248/1522	3.79 3.85	4.11	4.26	4.29	3.79 3.85
	uations reflect the expected goals	4	56	3	4	22 9	32 10	10		1049/1285 1302/1476	3.85	4.01	4.30	4.36	3.85
	readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	4	6	17	21	37	3.95	826/1412	3.95	4.02	4.22	4.20	3.95
	signments contribute to what you learned		68	2	2	2	10	7		****/1381	****	3.83	4.08	3.97	****
	ng system clearly explained	4	0	1	12	14	28	37		1038/1500	3.96	4.09	4.18	4.20	3.96
_	s was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	4	86		244/1517	4.96	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.96
	grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	1	4	29	26	18		1174/1497		3.96	4.11	4.11	3.72
	Lecture														
	ructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	6	5	23	57	4.44	891/1440	4.44	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.44
	actor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	4	5	19	63		1123/1448	4.55	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.55
	terial presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	8	27	25	29		1193/1436	3.81	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.81
	res contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	3	11	29	43	4.12		4.12	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.12
5. Did audiovisua	al techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	5	4	17	23	34	3.93	677/1221	3.93	4.08	3.93	4.02	3.93
	Discussion														
1. Did class disc	cussions contribute to what you learned	75	0	1	3	4	5	8	3.76	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.08	****
	ents actively encouraged to participate	75	0	1	0	2	4	14		****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.33	***
	actor encourage fair and open discussion	75	0	0	2	1	8	10		****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special t	echniques successful	75	11	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****
	Laboratory														
1. Did the lab in	crease understanding of the material	93	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.62	****
	ded with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.56	****
_	materials available for lab activities	93	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51	4.57	****
	structor provide assistance	93	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.72	****
5. Were requireme	ents for lab reports clearly specified	93	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	4.37	****
	Freq	quency	/ Dis	strik	outio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades	3			Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 11	0.00-0.99 1 A 12		 R∈	 quir	red f	or M	ajor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	23
28-55 11	1.00-1.99 0 B 32			1					-		-	-	, -		
56-83 9	2.00-2.99 12 C 29		Ge	nera	al			1	1	Under-g	rad 9	6	Non-	-major	73
84-150 10	3.00-3.49 16 D 2													-	
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 18 F 0		El	ecti	ves				6	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ŗh
	Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
	I 0		Ot	her				6	1						
	? 1														

Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 158 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	anier	ncies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	290/1522	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	623/1522	4.34	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	347/1285	4.42	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	473/1476	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	6	2	11	4.26	557/1412	4.07	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	482/1381	4.08	3.83	4.08	3.97	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	5	11	4.09	940/1500	3.75	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	767/1517	4.77	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	654/1497	4.19	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	432/1440	4.52	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	765/1448	4.69	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	845/1436	4.06	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	9	11	4.43	732/1432	4.32	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	461/1221	4.32	4.08	3.93	4.02	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	677/1280	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.08	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1020/1277	4.15	4.35	4.34	4.33	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	875/1269	4.17	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	287/ 854	4.15	3.94	4.02	4.00	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	52/ 215	4.56	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.74
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	58/ 228	4.48	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.68
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	37/ 217	4.68	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.89
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	118/ 216	4.45	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.53
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	2	1	4	11	4.16	128/ 205	4.02	4.30	4.23	4.37	4.16
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	4.50	4.25	4.41	4.83	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1			****	3.00	4.30	4.58	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	1		,	****	****	4.40	4.75	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	0	1			****	****	4.31	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	***	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	***	***

Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 158 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				?	0						

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Title Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 159 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies			:S		Ins	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	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	605/1522	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	13	4	4.17	965/1522	4.34	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	566/1285	4.42	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	4	4.06	982/1476	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	1	6	5	3.69	1065/1412	4.07	4.06	4.06	4.00	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	2	7	5	3.82	1000/1381	4.08	3.83	4.08	3.97	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	4	5	3	3.22	1401/1500	3.75	4.09	4.18	4.20	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	855/1517	4.77	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	421/1497	4.19	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	Ο	1	4	13	4.67	604/1440	4.52	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1448	4.69	4.64	4.71	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	906/1436	4.06	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	514/1432	4.32	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	279/1221	4.32	4.08	3.93	4.02	4.50
									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	677/1280	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.08	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1020/1277	4.15	4.35	4.34	4.33	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	798/1269	4.17	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.22
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	166/ 854	4.15	3.94	4.02	4.00	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	89/ 215	4.56	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	148/ 228	4.48	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.29
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	46/ 217	4.68	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	95/ 216	4.45	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	104/ 205	4.02	4.30	4.23	4.37	4.29

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				2	0						

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Title Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 16

Spring 2007

Page 160 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	M	377		-	ncies		-		ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	414/1522	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	654/1522	4.34	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	722/1285	4.42	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	475/1412	4.07	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	643/1381	4.08	3.83	4.08	3.97	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	8	4	3.88	1105/1500	3.75	4.09	4.18	4.20	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	802/1517	4.77	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	756/1497	4.19	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	1	10	4.25	1047/1440	4.52	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	1157/1448	4.69	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	1127/1436	4.06	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	935/1432	4.32	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	582/1221	4.32	4.08	3.93	4.02	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	477/1280	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.08	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	930/1277	4.15	4.35	4.34	4.33	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	875/1269	4.17	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 854	4.15	3.94	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	98/ 215	4.56	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.47
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	95/ 228	4.48	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.47
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	116/ 217	4.68	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	144/ 216	4.45	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.36
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	118/ 205	4.02	4.30	4.23	4.37	4.20

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-		-	
				2	Λ						

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Title

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 15

Spring 2007

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 161 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	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	4	11	4.73	350/1522	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	702/1522	4.34	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	578/1285	4.42	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	860/1476	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	722/1412	4.07	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	663/1381	4.08	3.83	4.08	3.97	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	2	3	5	3.40	1357/1500	3.75	4.09	4.18	4.20	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	341/1517	4.77	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	602/1497	4.19	3.96	4.11	4.11	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	682/1440	4.52	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	897/1448	4.69	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	980/1436	4.06	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	682/1432	4.32	4.18	4.29	4.31	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	373/1221	4.32	4.08	3.93	4.02	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	572/1280	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.08	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	721/1277	4.15	4.35	4.34	4.33	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	875/1269	4.17	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	538/ 854	4.15	3.94	4.02	4.00	3.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	63/ 215	4.56	4.37	4.36	4.62	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	83/ 228	4.48	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	106/ 217	4.68	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.58
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	121/ 216	4.45	4.41	4.42	4.72	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	2	0	3	5	3.58	181/ 205	4.02	4.30	4.23	4.37	3.58
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 80	***	1.00	4.11	4.00	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	25/ 47	4.50	4.25	4.41	4.83	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.75	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	***	***

Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor:

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 15

SANDOZ, JAMES W

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 161

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad 1	15	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	there a	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to b	oe sigr	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 17

19

Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 162 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eauer	cies	5		Inst	ructor	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	3	5	9	4.35	791/1522	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	7	4.24	894/1522	4.34	4.11	4.26	4.29	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	825/1285	4.42	4.01	4.30	4.36	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	982/1476	4.20	4.02	4.22	4.20	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	760/1412	4.07	4.06	4.06	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	1000/1381	4.08	3.83	4.08	3.97	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	860/1500	3.75	4.09	4.18	4.20	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	952/1517	4.77	4.73	4.65	4.63	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	8	3	3.79	1126/1497		3.96		4.11	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	984/1440	4.52	4.44	4.45	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	1224/1448	4.69	4.64	4.71	4.78	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	3	6	3		1224/1436	4.06		4.29	4.29	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	4	5		1108/1432		4.18	4.29	4.31	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	2	3	_		387/1221			3.93		4.36
5. Fix additioning techniques emance four anaerseanaing	-	_	Ü	Ü	_	5	O	1.50	30771221	1.52	1.00	3.75	1.02	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	839/1280	4.15	4.09	4.10	4.08	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	508/1277	4.15	4.35	4.34	4.33	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	_	4.63	493/1269	4.17	4.35	4.31	4.33	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	1	1	1	_	3.80	569/ 854	4.15		4.02	4.00	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	U		1	1	_	3.00	309/ 634	4.13	3.34	4.02	4.00	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	5	4	4 44	102/ 215	4 56	4.37	4 36	4.62	4.44
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	O	U	U	U	U	J	-	1.11	102/ 213	4.50	1.37	1.30	1.02	1.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	101/ 228	4.48	4.47	4.35	4.56	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	112/ 217	4.68	4.48	4.51	4.57	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	158/ 216	4.45	4.41		4.72	4.22
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	167/ 205		4.30		4.37	3.89
5. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	0	U	۷	U	U	2	5	3.09	107/ 203	4.02	4.30	4.23	4.37	3.09
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 78	****	1.00			****
-	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	1.00	4.45 4.11	5.00 4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	***/ 80	* * * *	1.00	4.11	4.00	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	4.50	4.25	4.41	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 45	****		4.41	4.58	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	ТО	U	U	Т	U	U	U	2.00	****/ 45		3.00	4.30	4.58	
Self Paced														
	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 27	****	1 (7	1 (2	****	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0 1	1		****/ 37 ****/ 22	****	4.67	4.63	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0		0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 23 ****/ 22	****	3.00	4.41	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1 1	0		0	0		****/ 18	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	U	Τ	U	0	U	U	1.00	, 18	^^^	4.67	4.49	^^^	* * * * *

Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 17

19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 162 JUN 26, 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	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	11				
				?	0						

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

(Instr. A)

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF Enrollment: 267

Questionnaires: 138

Page 163 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

C+11202+	00117000	Erroluntion	Oncationnoino
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

O combiner of			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	11	0	0	1	16	39	71	4.42	720/1522	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	4	16	59	49	4.20	935/1522	4.20	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	2	6	20	48	52	4.11	882/1285	4.11	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	56	0	3	11	27	31	4.19	860/1476	4.19	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	7	11	13	30	31	35	3.55	1138/1412	3.55	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	60	2	3	16	19	26	3.97	858/1381	3.97	3.83	4.08	4.13	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	2	5	24	35	61	4.17	871/1500	4.17	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	6	121	4.95	244/1517	4.95	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	3	0	1	15	71	23	4.05	865/1497	3.94	3.96	4.11	4.13	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	5	21	99	4.75	452/1440	4.65	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	3	1.4	108	4.84	656/1448	4.84	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	3	11	40	71	4.43	684/1436	4.34	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	3	10	23	89	4.58	548/1432	4.50	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	2	2	2	6	29	78	4.53	265/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.30
5. Did addition bad teething the four anderbeataing		_	-	_	O	2,	, 0	1.33	203/1221	1.30	1.00	3.75	3.71	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	87	0	3	3	8	12	25	4.04	707/1280	4.04	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	87	0	1	1	8	7	34	4.41	682/1277	4.41	4.35	4.34	4.38	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	88	0	1	1	6	11	31	4.40	671/1269	4.40	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	90	15	0	1	11	9	12	3.97	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	1	A	29	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	70
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	В	54						
56-83	20	2.00-2.99	8	C	18	General	8	Under-grad	138	Non-major	68
84-150	22	3.00-3.49	17	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	41	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	86	_			
				?	5						

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 164

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101 University of Maryland Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION Instructor: OMLAND, KEVIN E (Instr. B)

Enrollment:	267				
Questionnaires:	138	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

? 5

			Fr	_	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	11	0	0	1	16	39	71	4.42	720/1522	4.42	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	4	16	59	49	4.20	935/1522	4.20	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	2	6	20	48	52	4.11	882/1285	4.11	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.11
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	56	0	3	11	27	31	4.19	860/1476	4.19	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	7	11	13	30	31	35	3.55	1138/1412	3.55	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	60	2	3	16	19	26	3.97	858/1381	3.97	3.83	4.08	4.13	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	2	5	24	35	61	4.17	871/1500	4.17	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	6	121	4.95	244/1517	4.95	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	50	1	2	4	17	48	16	3.83	1097/1497	3.94	3.96	4.11	4.13	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	52	0	0	0	9	21	56	4.55	751/1440	4 65	4.44	4 45	4.46	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	51	0	0	0	2	10	75	4.84	683/1448		4.64	4.71	4.71	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	52	0	1	4	14	21	46	4.24	886/1436		4.18	4.29	4.30	4.34
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	3	10	17	56	4.43	732/1432		4.18	4.29		4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	55	6	4	4	11	21	37	4.08	582/1221		4.08	3.93		4.30
5. Fix dadiovibadi ocominques cimanos four anacistanding	0.0		-	-			٥,	1.00	302, 1221	1.50	1.00	3.33	3.71	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	87	0	3	3	8	12	25	4.04	707/1280	4.04	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	87	0	1	1	8	7	34	4.41	682/1277	4.41	4.35	4.34	4.38	4.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	88	0	1	1	6	11	31	4.40	671/1269	4.40	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	90	15	0	1	11	9	12	3.97	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****
Fred														
	uency	Dis	trik	utio	n									
Gradita Farnad Grad Grades		Dis	trik			a			Tr				Majord	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades		Dis	trik		n ason	.s			Ту.	pe 		. — — — — —	Majors	3
				Re	ason									
00-27 17 0.00-0.99 1 A 29				Re			·	 9	Ty Graduat		0	 Majo		70
00-27 17 0.00-0.99 1 A 29 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 54		 Re	 quir	Re ed f	ason		 `s		Graduat	- e		Majo	or	70
00-27 17 0.00-0.99 1 A 29 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 54 56-83 20 2.00-2.99 8 C 18		 Re		Re ed f	ason		 S	 9 8		- e		Majo		
00-27 17 0.00-0.99 1 A 29 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 54 56-83 20 2.00-2.99 8 C 18 84-150 22 3.00-3.49 17 D 0		Re Ge	 quir	Re ed f	ason			8	Graduat Under-g	e rad 13	8	Majo	or -major	70 68
00-27 17 0.00-0.99 1 A 29 28-55 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 54 56-83 20 2.00-2.99 8 C 18		Re Ge	 quir	Re ed f	ason				Graduat	e rad 13 Means t	8 here a	Majo Non- are not	or -major	70 68

MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires:

LINDAHL, LASSE (Instr. A)

275

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 165 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

1 2 0	Q+	a	The second second second	0
138	Student	course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque		s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	9	0	11	15	41	46	16		1454/1522		4.29	4.30	4.34	3.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	13	15	49	35	16		1458/1522		4.11	4.26	4.25	3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	9	21	40	39	19		1216/1285		4.01	4.30	4.30	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13 13	78 3	6 11	11 12	16 33	8 30	6 36		1427/1476 1138/1412		4.02 4.06	4.22 4.06	4.26 4.03	2.94 3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	91	5	4	14	4	30 7		****/1381	****	3.83	4.08	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	1	2	7	26	31	58		940/1500		4.09	4.18	4.13	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	2	1	1	2.0	68			1201/1517		4.73	4.65	4.62	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	36	2	10	15	39	28	8		1410/1497			4.11		3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	2	5	26	38	53	4.09	1155/1440	3.78	4.44	4.45	4.46	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	1	5	23	51	44		1346/1448		4.64	4.71	4.71	3.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	13	17	40	31	22		1349/1436		4.18	4.29	4.30	3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	15	17	31	41	19		1333/1432		4.18	4.29	4.29	3.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	8	13	14	29	28	31	3.43	938/1221	3.25	4.08	3.93	3.94	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	104	0	10	4	8	5	7	2 85	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	104	0	4	3	6	8	13		****/1277		4.35	4.34	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	104	0	5	2	6	7	14		****/1269		4.35	4.31	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	104	20	2	1	3	3	5		****/ 854		3.94	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	133	2	1	0	0	1	1		****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.21	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	3	0	0	1	0		****/ 228		4.47	4.35	4.29	****
<u>.</u>	134	2	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 217 ****/ 216		4.48	4.51	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	135 136	2 1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 205		4.41	4.42	4.35 4.26	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports crearry specified	130	1	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 205		4.30	4.23	4.20	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	137	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	136	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.39	****
Self Paced						_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	137	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,	****	4.67	4.63	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	136	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
Fred	iency	Dis	trib	nıtio	n									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	ļ
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	26	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	38
28-55	20	1.00-1.99	0	В	44						
56-83	25	2.00-2.99	13	С	24	General	2	Under-grad 1	.37	Non-major	100
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	20	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	ſh
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	94	_			
				2	3						

MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI

Title Instructor:

BRADLEY, BRIAN (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 166 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	275
Questionnaires:	138

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,skills from	this course	9	0	11	15	41	46	16	3.32	1454/15	22	3.32	4.29	4.30	4.34	3.32
		tor make clear the exp		10	0	13	15	49	35	16		1458/15		3.20	4.11	4.26	4.25	3.20
		estions reflect the ex		10	0	9	21	40	39	19		1216/12		3.30	4.01	4.30	4.30	3.30
		ations reflect the exp		13	78	6	11	16	8	6	2.94	1427/14	176	2.94	4.02	4.22	4.26	2.94
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribute to w	hat you learned	13	3	11	12	33	30	36	3.56	1138/14	12	3.56	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.56
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contribute to	what you learned	13	91	5	4	14	4	7	3.12	****/13	881	****	3.83	4.08	4.13	****
		system clearly explai	ned	13	1	2	7	26	31	58	4.10	940/15	00	4.10	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.10
	-	was class cancelled		13	2	1	1	2	68	51		1201/15		4.36	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.36
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overall teach	ing effectiveness	42	1	10	8	40	26	11	3.21	1382/14	197	3.15	3.96	4.11	4.13	3.15
		Lecture																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures well p	repared	29	0	9	10	35	31	24	3.47	1365/14	40	3.78	4.44	4.45	4.46	3.78
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem interested in	the subject	29	0	5	10	22	34	38	3.83	1394/14	48	3.95	4.64	4.71	4.71	3.95
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented and ex	plained clearly	29	0	12	23	30	31	13	3.09	1373/14	136	3.18	4.18	4.29	4.30	3.18
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to what y	ou learned	29	0	20	7	32	31	19	3.20	1344/14	132	3.23	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.23
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enhance yo	ur understanding	29	25	12	13	27	21	11	3.07	1056/12	221	3.25	4.08	3.93	3.94	3.25
		Discussion																
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribute to w	hat vou learned	104	0	10	4	8	5	7	2.85	****/12	280	****	4.09	4.10	4.14	****
		ts actively encouraged	_	104	0	4	3	6	8	13	3.68	****/12	277	****	4.35	4.34	4.38	****
		tor encourage fair and		104	0	5	2	6	7	14	3.68	****/12	269	****	4.35	4.31	4.39	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques successful		104	20	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	****/ 8	354	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****
		Laboratory																
1. Did the	e lab inc	rease understanding of	the material	133	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 2	215	****	4.37	4.36	4.21	****
		ed with adequate backs		134	0	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/ 2	228	****	4.47	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were ne	ecessary	materials available fo	r lab activities	134	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 2	217	****	4.48	4.51	4.45	****
4. Did the	e lab ins	tructor provide assist	ance	135	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 2	216	***	4.41	4.42	4.35	****
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab reports cle	arly specified	136	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 2	205	****	4.30	4.23	4.26	****
		Field Work																
1. Did fie	eld exper	ience contribute to wh	at you learned	137	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	47	****	4.25	4.41	4.56	****
		understand your evalu		136	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/	45	****	3.00	4.30	4.39	****
		Self Paced																
1 Did se	lf-paced	system contribute to w	hat von learned	137	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/	37	****	4.67	4.63	5.00	****
		k/tutoring by proctors		136	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/	22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
						1												
			Freq	uency	DIS	trip	utio	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s				Тур	e			Majors	}
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 2	A 26			auir	ed f	or M	aior		1	 Gradı	at.e	· ·	1	Majo	 or	38
28-55	20	1.00-1.99 0	В 44			1				-		-1440			•			
56-83	25	2.00-2.99 13	C 24		Ge	nera	1				2	Under	-gr	ad 13	7	Non-	-major	100
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 20	D 1										-				-	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 18	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	####	- M	leans t	here a	are not	enoug	ıh
			P 0									respo	nse	s to b	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
		I 0		Ot	her				9	4								

? 3

itle MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 24

Ouestionnaires: 16

·

Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 167

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 2 11 2 3.81 1264/1522 4.12 4.29 4.30 4.34 3.81 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 7 8 4.44 654/1522 4.46 4.11 4.26 4.25 4.44 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 2 4 10 4.50 531/1285 4.36 4.01 4.30 4.30 4.50 0 2 8 5 4.20 860/1476 4.06 4.02 4.22 4.26 4.20 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 4 2 1 5 2 3.25 1287/1412 3.66 4.06 4.06 4.03 3.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 2 4 7 1 3.33 1227/1381 3.86 3.83 4.08 4.13 3.33 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 7 7 4.31 720/1500 4.33 4.09 4.18 4.13 4.31 Λ 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 341/1517 4.89 4.73 4.65 4.62 4.94 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 1 10 3 4.14 782/1497 4.22 3.96 4.11 4.13 4.14 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 2 13 4.87 256/1440 4.64 4.44 4.45 4.46 4.87 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 4 11 4.73 897/1448 4.65 4.64 4.71 4.71 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 7 6 4.27 865/1436 4.40 4.18 4.29 4.30 4.27 0 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 1 8 5 4.07 1009/1432 4.31 4.18 4.29 4.29 4.07 1 0 1 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3 0 0 3 5 4 4.08 578/1221 4.30 4.08 3.93 3.94 4.08 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 3.33 1106/1280 4.07 4.09 4.10 4.14 3.33 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 3 1 3.67 1094/1277 4.24 4.35 4.34 4.38 3.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 1 3 2 0 3.17 1194/1269 4.16 4.35 4.31 4.39 3.17 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 854 3.10 3.94 4.02 4.00 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2 Λ Λ Λ 2 9 3 4.07 160/215 4.41 4.37 4.36 4.21 4.07 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 7 4 4.07 173/ 228 4.50 4.47 4.35 4.29 4.07 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 108/ 217 4.59 4.48 4.51 4.45 4.57 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 66/ 216 4.55 4.41 4.42 4.35 4.77 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2 0 0 8 6 4.43 82/ 205 4.51 4.30 4.23 4.26 4.43 Seminar 15 0 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 2.00 4.58 4.53 **** 0 4.00 ****/ 77 **** 1.50 4.52 4.30 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 Ω Ω Ω Ω 1 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 65 **** 1.00 4.49 4.33 **** 15 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 78 **** 1.00 4.45 4.34 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 80 **** 1.00 4.11 3.33 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 4.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.25 4.41 4.56 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 15 0 0 4.00 ****/ 45 **** 3.00 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 15 0 0 4.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.68 **** 0 1 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 15 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.26 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 15 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 34 **** *** 4.30 4.12 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 4.00 ****/ 37 **** 4.67 4.63 5.00 0 1 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 15 0 00 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 23 **** 3.00 4.41 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 15 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.69 4.75 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 15 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 22 **** 4.67 4.54 **** **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 15 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 18 **** 4.67 4.49 **** ****

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 167 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	i
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 168 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies In			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect				
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	791/1522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	811/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	825/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	7	4.06	982/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	5	2	4	3.36	1248/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	9	4	4.00	806/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	799/1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	292/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	769/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.15
Lecture														
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 	1	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	578/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	1048/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	876/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	1	11	4.25	884/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	0	7	5	4.15	532/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	459/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1		4.57	547/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	654/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	****
_ ,														
Laboratory	_	_		_		_								
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	155/ 215	4.41	4.37		4.21	4.11
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	83/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	3	5		98/ 217	4.59		4.51	4.45	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	69/ 216	4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	56/ 205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.63
Quality and														
Seminar	1.0	0	0	0	0	^	1	F 00	****/ 70	****	0 00	4 50	4 52	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79 ****/ 77	****		4.58	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16		0	1	0	0	0	2.00	, , ,		1.50	4.52	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.33	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.59	****
		0	0	1	0	0	-		****/ 35	****	****			****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	U	U	Τ	U	U	0	2.00	^^^^/ 35		* * * * *	4.31	4.26	^ ^ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****
5. Mere effere effought proceeds for all the students	10	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	, 10		1.07	1.12		

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 168 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 169 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Questions							equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rar	_	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 1																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	4	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	859/1	522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.29
		tor make clear			4	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	592/1		4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.47
		estions reflect			4	0	0	1	0	9	7	4.29	738/1		4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.29
		ations reflect			4	1	0	2	0	6	8	4.25	792/1	1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.25
			_	nat you learned	4	1	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	964/1	412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.81
	-	-		what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	7	4	3.71	1076/1	1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	3.71
		system clearly		_	4	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	527/1	1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.47
8. How ma	ny times v	was class cance	elled		4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	292/1	L517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.94
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	534/1	L497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.40
		Lecture	a																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	_	repared	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	320/1	440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.64
		the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	548/1		4.65	4.64	4.71		4.83		
		plained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	576/1		4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.53		
		ou learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	611/1		4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.53		
		ur understanding	4	5	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	351/1						4.35		
		Discus																	
1 Did al	agg diggu			nat you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	286/1	201	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.67
				to participate	15	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	867/1		4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.07
				open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.17	586/1		4.16	4.35	4.34	4.39	4.17
		chniques succes		open discussion	15	4	0	0	1	1	0		****/		3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	****
4. Wele S	special ter	cilitiques succes	ssiui		13	7	U	U		_	U	3.30	, , ,	034	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	
		Laborat	cory																
1. Did th	ne lab inc	rease understar	nding of	the material	5	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	59/	215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.69
_	_	_	_	round information	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75		228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.75
3. Were n	necessary m	materials avail	lable fo	r lab activities	5	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	110/	217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.56
		tructor provide			5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	69/	216	4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.75
5. Were r	requirement	ts for lab repo	orts cle	arly specified	5	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	41/	205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.69
		Semina	c																
1. Were a	ssigned to	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	79	***	2.00	4.58	4.53	***
				Frequ	uency	Dist	rib	ution	n										
G dit		G GDA						5.										M	
Credits E	:arned 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Ту <u>г</u>	ре 			Majors 	} 	
00-27	0	A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Grad	duate	=	0	Majo	or	10		
28-55																			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				1	Unde	er-gi	rad 2	21	Non-	-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	7 4	D 0															
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				2			Means t			_	ſh		
				P 0									resp	onse	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	.3							
				? 0															

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0301 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 170

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

							LTC	equei	TCTES			TIID	LIUCLUI	-	Course	Debr	UMDC	пелет	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1																
1 Did voi	anin new	insights,ski		this course	4	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	859/1	522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.29
						-	0			7	9								
		or make clear			4	0	-	0	1		9	4.47	592/1		4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.47
		stions reflec			4	0	0	1	0	9	7	4.29	738/1	L285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.29
4. Did oth	ner evaluat	tions reflect	the expe	ected goals	4	1	0	2	0	6	8	4.25	792/1	L476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.25
5. Did ass	signed read	dings contrib	ute to wh	nat you learned	4	1	1	1	3	6	5	3.81	964/1	412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.81
				2															
6 Did mai	++02 0001	~~~~	ibuta ta	what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	7	4	2 71	1076/1	201	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	3.71
					4			_			_								
		system clearl		ied	4	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	- ,		4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.47
		as class canc			4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	292/1	L517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.94
9. How wou	ıld you gra	ade the overa	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	481/1	L497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.40
				3															
		Lectur																	
		tor's lecture	1	•	0	•	0	0	_	0	4 46	051/1	440	1 6 1		4 45	4 46	4 6 4	
			8	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	851/1		4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.64		
		the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	840/1	L448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.83		
3. Was led	cture mate	lained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	564/1	L436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.53		
4. Did the	lectures	contribute t	ou learned	8	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	600/1	432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.53	
		r understanding	10	4	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	442/1		4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94			
J. Did auc	iiovisuai i	recilitques en	ir understanding	10	4		U	U		5	4.43	442/1	L Z Z I	4.30	4.00	3.93	3.94	4.33	
		Discus																	
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contrib	nat you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	286/1	L280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.67	
2. Were al	ll students	s actively en	to participate	15	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	867/1	L277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	4.17	
		_	_	open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	586/1			4.35	4.31	4.39	4.50
			Open discussion		4	0	0	1	1	0								****	
4. were sp	pecial teci	nniques succe	ssiui		15	4	U	U	Τ	Τ	U	3.50	****/	854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	* * * *
		Labora	tory																
1. Did the	e lab incre	ease understa	ndina of	the material	5	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	59/	215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.69
				cound information	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	45/	228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.75
_	_	_	_	lab activities	5	0	1	0	1	1	13	4.56			4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.56
	_																		
		ructor provid			5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	69/		4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.75
5. Were re	equirements	s for lab rep	orts clea	arly specified	5	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	41/	205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.69
		Semina	r																
1 Were as	reigned to			announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/	79	****	2.00	4.58	4.53	****
i. Weie as	sargired cor	Pics lelevant	to the a	illiouncea cheme	20	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/	15		2.00	1.50	4.55	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utior	1										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons					Typ	e			Majors	
				- 															
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Rec	mire	ad fo	or Ma	ior	c	0	Grad	duate	_	0	Majo	r	10
						vec	14116	_u (JI Md	ובטנ	U	0	Grac	uatt	-	J	ria JC	, <u> </u>	Τ.0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 1	В 6														_	
56-83	3	C 1		Ger	neral	L				1	Unde	er-gr	ad 2	1	Non-	major	11		
84-150	3	D 0																	
Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	4	F 0		$El\epsilon$	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				2	####	‡ – N	leans t	here a	re not	enoua	h
	-	- /	=	P 0											es to b			_	
						04-1-					-	2	rest	OIIDE	. D L U L	c argii	Cal		
				I 0		Oth	ıer				1	5							
				? 0															

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0302 University of Maryland Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Page 171

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

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	3	8	5	4.13	1033/1522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	477/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	674/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1233/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	4	6	3.80	973/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	5	5	3.94	898/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	780/1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	555/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	695/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	798/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	859/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	601/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	935/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.99
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	394/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	907/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	375/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	586/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	131/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	135/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	147/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.42
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	139/ 216	4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.42
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	84/ 205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.42

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0302 University of Maryland Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: (Instr. B) Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 172

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

0 1 5 6 4.42 84/205 4.51 4.30 4.23 4.26 4.42

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 5 4.13 1033/1522 4.12 4.29 4.30 4.34 4.13 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals
0 0 0 0 2 6 8 4.38 674/1285 4.30 4.01 1.00 1.00

1 1 4 6 4 3.69 1233/1476 4.06 4.02 4.22 4.26 3.69
1 2 4 6 3 80 973/1412 3.66 4.06 4.03 3.80 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 06 5 5 3.94 0 898/1381 3.86 3.83 4.08 4.13 3.94 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 3 3 9 4.25 780/1500 4.33 4.09 4.18 4.13 4.25 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 2 14 4.88 555/1517 4.89 4.73 4.65 4.62 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 1 5 4 4.30 602/1497 4.22 3.96 4.11 4.13 4.26 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 6 0 Ω Ω 3 3 4 4.10 1148/1440 4.64 4.44 4.45 4.46 4.30 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 0 1 0 5 4 4.20 1319/1448 4.65 4.64 4.71 4.71 4.47 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6 0 1 1 3 5 4.10 1003/1436 4.40 4.18 4.29 4.30 4.30 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 0 1 0 3 2 4 3.80 1170/1432 4.31 4.18 4.29 4.29 3.99 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 5 1 0 0 2 2 3.80 759/1221 4.30 4.08 3.93 3.94 4.08 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 1 2 3.75 907/1280 4.07 4.09 4.10 4.14 3.75 1 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 375/1277 4.24 4.35 4.34 4.38 4.75 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 586/1269 4.16 4.35 4.31 4.39 4.50 12 2 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 854 3.10 3.94 4.02 4.00 **** 4. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 4 0 0 2 5 4.25 131/215 4.41 4.37 4.36 4.21 4.25 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 4 0 0 0 1 6 5 4.33 135/ 228 4.50 4.47 4.35 4.29 4.33 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4 0 0 2 3 7 4.42 147/ 217 4.59 4.48 4.51 4.45 4.42 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 0 2 3 7 4.42 139/216 4.55 4.41 4.42 4.35 4.42 4 0 0 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 4 0 0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				2	0						

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Title Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 20 Spring 2007

Page 173 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	2	5	10		1001/1522			4.30		4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	750/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	509/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	903/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	728/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	643/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37		4.33		4.18		4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	16		623/1517		4.73	4.65	4.62	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	3	4	7	3.88	1057/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	392/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	1036/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	6	12	4.47	636/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	5	12	4.32	838/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	373/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	743/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	586/1269	4.16		4.31	4.39	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	747/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	3.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	131/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	71/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.58
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	51/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	69/ 216	4.55		4.42		4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	84/ 205	4.51		4.23		4.42
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	O	O	O	O	_	5	O	1.12	01/ 203	1.51	1.50	1.25	1.20	1.12
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.34	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	3.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	****	****
		-	-	-	-	-	_		, 10					
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıt i or	า									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	.0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 19 ? 1

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0402 Title

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 18

Spring 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 174 JUN 26, 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	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	814/1522	4.12	4 29	4.30	4.34	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	545/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	752/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	11	4	4.12	945/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	5	6	3		1077/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	10	5	4.11	743/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	374/1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	16	4.94		4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	232/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.71
Lecture	0	0	0	0	_	_	1.0	4 60	604/1440	4 6 4		4 45	4 46	4 60
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	604/1440		4.44	4.45	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	12		1060/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	/	9	4.39	741/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	-	0	0	_	6	10		707/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Τ	2	U	0	3	3	9	4.40	359/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	70/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.63
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	45/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.75
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	76/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	56/ 216		4.41	4.42	4.35	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	23/ 205		4.30	4.23	4.26	4.88
Frequ	on as	Diet	rih	ıtior	2									
rtedn	ency	ומדמ	-1100	ac I OI	1									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				?	1						

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

CARUSO, STEVEN

Instructor:

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 175 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eanei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	4	6		1074/1522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	322/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	337/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4			815/1476		4.02	4.22	4.26	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	5	2	3		1143/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	806/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5		4.42		4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	623/1517	4.89	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	820/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1		4.75	452/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	8		1089/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	502/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	350/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	124/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1161/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1136/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1194/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	3.17
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	3.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	47/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44		4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	7		65/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	183/ 216	4.55	4.41	4.42		3.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	137/ 205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.11
Garden and														
Seminar	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	2 00	4.58	4 E2	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.00		4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12 12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.50	4.52	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	1.00	$4.45 \\ 4.11$	4.34	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	12	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 60		1.00	4.11	3.33	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	5.00	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	***	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	***	4.67	4.49	****	***

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 13

CARUSO, STEVEN Enrollment: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 175 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 15

Page 176 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	•	0	•	_	•	0	2 60	1265/1500	4 10	4 00	4 20	4 2 4	2 60
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	9	2		1365/1522	4.12	4.29	4.30	4.34	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	935/1522	4.46	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	8	5	4.07	904/1285	4.36	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	10	3		1091/1476	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3 1	5	4	3		1189/1412	3.66	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	Ţ	_	3	7	3		1097/1381	3.86	3.83	4.08	4.13	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5			1058/1500	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.13	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11		837/1517		4.73	4.65	4.62	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	9	1	3.85	1081/1497	4.22	3.96	4.11	4.13	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	492/1440	4.64	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	897/1448	4.65	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	720/1436	4.40	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	928/1432	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	408/1221	4.30	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.33
100000000000000000000000000000000000000														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1280	4.07	4.09	4.10	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1277	4.24	4.35	4.34	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/1269	4.16	4.35	4.31	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 854	3.10	3.94	4.02	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	109/ 215	4.41	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	83/ 228	4.50	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	147/ 217	4.59	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.42
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	154/ 216	4.55	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	84/ 205	4.51	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.42
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.53	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.34	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_		-	
				2	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101 University of Maryland Title CELL BIOLOGY Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007

Page 177

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 227

Ouestionnaires: 99 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 Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 7 0 6 10 26 23 27 3.60 1368/1522 3.60 4.29 4.30 4.34 3.60 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 7 0 6 10 26 23 27 3.60 1368/1522 3.60 4.29 4.30 4.34 3.60 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 8 0 14 21 27 14 15 2.95 1488/1522 2.95 4.11 4.26 4.25 2.95 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 7 1 15 23 21 17 15 2.93 1259/1285 2.93 4.01 4.30 4.30 2.93 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 7 80 5 0 2 2 3 2.83 ****/1476 **** 4.02 4.22 4.26 **** 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8 3 12 18 20 20 18 3.16 1310/1412 3.16 4.06 4.06 4.03 3.16 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 8 81 4 1 2 2 1 2.50 ****/1381 **** 3.83 4.08 4.13 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained
9. How many times was class cancelled 9 1 24 10 16 18 21 3.02 1428/1500 3.02 4.09 4.18 4.13 3.02 8. How many times was class cancelled 7 2 0 0 0 1 89 4.99 98/1517 4.99 4.73 4.65 4.62 4.99 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 15 0 22 15 28 17 2 2.55 1475/1497 2.77 3.96 4.11 4.13 2.77 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 10 10 16 28 27 3.57 1349/1440 3.88 4.44 4.45 4.46 3.88 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 7 7 15 24 38 3.87 1389/1448 3.91 4.64 4.71 4.71 3.91 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 23 13 25 19 11 2.80 1403/1436 3.11 4.18 4.29 4.30 3.11 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 1 15 21 19 15 19 3.02 1362/1432 3.23 4.18 4.29 4.29 3.23 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 9 18 11 20 15 16 3.00 1064/1221 3.37 4.08 3.93 3.94 3.37 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 87 0 5 1 4 1 1 2.33 ****/1280 **** 4.09 4.10 4.14 **** 87 0 4 1 3 2 2 2.75 ****/1277 **** 4.35 4.34 4.38 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 87 0 3 1 3 2 3 3.08 ****/1269 **** 4.35 4.31 4.39 ****

Spring 2007

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	28	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	47
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	27						
56-83	32	2.00-2.99	7	C	20	General	1	Under-grad	99	Non-major	52
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	15	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	28	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	74	_			
				?	6						

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101 University of Maryland Page 178 JUN 26, 2007

Title CELL BIOLOGY Baltimore County (Instr. B) Spring 2007

Instructor:

Enrollment: 227 Questionnaires: 99

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

								_	ncie	s .	_		tructor	Course	_			Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,sk	ills fr	om this course	7	0	6	10	26	23	27	3.60	1368/1522	3.60	4.29	4.30	4.34	3.60
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clea:	r the e	xpected goals	8	0	14	21	27	14	15	2.95	1488/1522	2.95	4.11	4.26	4.25	2.95
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions refle	ct the	expected goals	7	1	15	23	21	17	15	2.93	1259/1285	2.93	4.01	4.30	4.30	2.93
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect	t the e	xpected goals	7	80	5	0	2	2	3	2.83	****/1476	****	4.02	4.22	4.26	****
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contril	oute to	what you learned	8	3	12	18	20	20	18	3.16	1310/1412	3.16	4.06	4.06	4.03	3.16
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments cont:	ribute	to what you learned	8	81	4	1	2	2	1	2.50	****/1381	****	3.83	4.08	4.13	****
		g system clear:		ained	9	1	24	10	16	18	21		1428/1500		4.09	4.18	4.13	3.02
		was class can			7	2	0	0	0	1	89	4.99	, -		4.73	4.65	4.62	
9. How wo	ould you	grade the over	all tea	ching effectiveness	16	0	14	9	28	28	4	2.99	1422/1497	2.77	3.96	4.11	4.13	2.77
		Lectu		_														
		uctor's lectur			16	0	3	2	15	20			1100/1440			4.45	4.46	3.88
		ctor seem inte			16	0	3	6	18	21			1369/1448	3.91	4.64	4.71	4.71	3.91
				explained clearly	16	0	7		20	27	17		1308/1436		4.18	4.29	4.30	3.11
		es contribute			17	0	9	13	16	21			1294/1432		4.18	4.29	4.29	3.23
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques ei	nhance	your understanding	19	4	7	8	12	20	29	3.74	797/1221	3.37	4.08	3.93	3.94	3.37
		Discus	aaion															
1 Did al	laga diga			what you learned	87	0	5	1	4	1	1	2 22	****/1280	****	4 00	4 10	1 11	****
i. Dia Ci	lass disc	ussions concil	Jule 10	what you rearned	0 /	U	5		4			2.33	/1Z60		4.09	4.10	4.14	
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively e	ncourag	ed to participate	87	0	4	1	3	2	2	2.75	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.38	****
				nd open discussion	87	0	3	1	3	2	3	3.08	****/1269	****		4.31	4.39	****
		3		-														
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 28		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r)r	47
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	в 27						-						_		
56-83	32	2.00-2.99	7	C 20		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 9	9	Non-	major	52
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	15	D 3														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	28	F 0		El	ecti	ves				3	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
				P 1									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot	her				7	4						
				? 6														

Course-Section: BIOL 304L 0101 University of Maryland Title PLANT BIOLOGY LAB

Baltimore County

Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN Enrollment: 94 Questionnaires: 78 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2007

Page 179

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

	Questions	:	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sec Mea
	General															
l. Did you gain n	ew insights, skills from this course	е	8	0	0	0	7	26	37	4.43	707/1522	4.43	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.4
. Did the instru	ctor make clear the expected goals		10	0	0	0	4	20	44	4.59	454/1522	4.59	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.5
. Did the exam q	uestions reflect the expected goals	S	9	0	2	3	10	26	28	4.09	893/1285	4.09	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.0
. Did other eval	uations reflect the expected goals		9	1	0	2	7	23	36	4.37	671/1476	4.37	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.3
. Did assigned r	eadings contribute to what you lear	rned	11	3	0	1	12	14	37	4.36	475/1412	4.36	4.06	4.06	4.03	4.3
	signments contribute to what you le		11	2	0	0	12	25	28	4.25	614/1381		3.83	4.08	4.13	4.2
	g system clearly explained		10	1	0	2	6	14	45	4.52	463/1500		4.09	4.18	4.13	4.5
-	was class cancelled		11	0	0	0	0	5	62	4.93	389/1517		4.73	4.65	4.62	4.9
). How would you	grade the overall teaching effective	veness	4	1	0	0	5	32	36	4.42	481/1497	4.42	3.96	4.11	4.13	4.4
	Lecture															
. Were the instr	uctor's lectures well prepared		26	0	0	0	0	6	46	4.88	224/1440	4.88	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.8
	ctor seem interested in the subject		27	0	0	0	1	5	45	4.86	602/1448		4.64	4.71	4.71	4.8
	terial presented and explained clea		27	0	0	0	4	8	39	4.69	394/1436		4.18	4.29	4.30	4.6
	es contribute to what you learned		27	0	0	0	3	6	42	4.76	338/1432		4.18	4.29	4.29	4.7
. Did audiovisua	l techniques enhance your understar	nding	31	13	5	1	7	6	15	3.74	797/1221	3.74	4.08	3.93	3.94	3.7
	Discussion															
	ussions contribute to what you lear		59	0	1	0	7	4	7	3.84	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.14	* * *
	nts actively encouraged to partici;	_	59	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.38	***
	ctor encourage fair and open discus		60	0	1	0	4	6	7		****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.39	***
. Were special t	echniques successful		62	8	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	***
	Laboratory															
	crease understanding of the materia		43	0	0	0	1	13	21	4.57	78/ 215		4.37	4.36	4.21	4.5
	ded with adequate background inform		43	0	0	0	3	4	28	4.71	53/ 228		4.47	4.35	4.29	4.7
	materials available for lab activ		43	0	0	0	2	7	26	4.69	87/ 217		4.48	4.51	4.45	4.6
	structor provide assistance		43	1	1	0	1	7	25	4.62	103/ 216			4.42	4.35	4.6
. Were requireme	nts for lab reports clearly specif:	ied	43	0	0	1	2	5	27	4.66	49/ 205	4.66	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.6
	Field Work															
_	rience contribute to what you lear		77	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.56	***
_	y understand your evaluation criter		77	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.39	***
	ctor available for consultation		77	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.68	* * *
_	could you discuss your evaluations		77	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.26	
. Did conference	s help you carry out field activit:	ıes	77	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.12	***
		Freque	ncy	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected (Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27 1	0.00-0.99 0 A 2	 2		Rec	 กบ่า		or M	aior		1	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	 49
28-55 0	1.00-1.99 0 B 32				1~++	-u I	J_ 11	⊥∪ر ما	~	_	Siddad	_		1100		1.7
56-83 0		7		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 5	78	Non-	major	29
84-150 38		0		001	- J- U.	_				_	011401 9		-	2.011		
Grad. 0		0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ηh
-		0									respons				_	-
	I (0		Oth	ıer				5	9			. 5-			
		3														

Title COMP. ANIMAL PHYSIOLOG

Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E

Enrollment: 201
Questionnaires: 64

Baltimore County Spring 2007

University of Maryland

Page 180 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	6	8	27	21	3.97	1161/1522	3.97	4.29	4.30	4.34	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	12	19	16	11	3.25	1442/1522	3.25	4.11	4.26	4.25	3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	4	14	12	18	14	3.39	1204/1285	3.39	4.01	4.30	4.30	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	49	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	****/1476	****	4.02	4.22	4.26	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	6	7	22	27	4.13	680/1412	4.13	4.06	4.06	4.03	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	51	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	****/1381	****	3.83	4.08	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	5	11	19	27	4.10	940/1500	4.10	4.09	4.18	4.13	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	57	4.90	487/1517	4.90	4.73	4.65	4.62	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	6	9	16	18	7	3.20	1388/1497	3.20	3.96	4.11	4.13	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	10	18	33	4.30	1007/1440	4.30	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	7	27	29	4.35	1266/1448	4.35	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.35
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	5	9	16	18	13	3.41	1315/1436	3.41	4.18	4.29	4.30	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	10	9	12	14	18	3.33	1320/1432	3.33	4.18	4.29	4.29	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	3	16	18	24	3.98	623/1221	3.98	4.08	3.93	3.94	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	49	0	3	2	5	2	3	3.00	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	0	2	5	0	7	3.86	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	50	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	49	11	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.00	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	48
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	17						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	20	General	0	Under-grad	64	Non-major	16
84-150	39	3.00-3.49	18	D	4						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	58	-			
				?	3						

Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA

Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 98
Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 181 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Quantitation in					Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1 Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,skills fro	m this course	2	0	1	1	5	7	43	4.58	525/1522	4.58	4.29	4.30	4.34	4.58
		ctor make clear the ex		2	0	0	1	7	5	44	4.61	419/1522		4.11	4.26	4.25	4.61
		lestions reflect the e		3	0	1	4	5	12	34	4.32	714/1285		4.01	4.30	4.30	4.32
		ations reflect the ex		3	0	0	1	6	15	34	4.46	535/1476		4.02	4.22	4.26	4.46
		eadings contribute to		5	7	1	4	5	10	27	4.23	585/1412		4.06	4.06	4.03	4.23
	_	signments contribute t	-	5	4	0	6	8	13	23	4.06	774/1381		3.83	4.08	4.13	4.06
		g system clearly expla	_	3	0	0	3	6	16	31	4.34	700/1500			4.18	4.13	4.34
		was class cancelled	iiica	3	0	0	0	0	6	50	4.89	509/1517		4.73	4.65	4.62	4.89
		grade the overall teac	hing effectiveness	12	0	2	0	4	17	24	4.30	612/1497				4.13	
J. 110W WC	oura you	grade the overall teac	ning circociveness		Ü	_	Ü	-			1.50	012/115/	1.50	3.70		1.15	1.50
		Lecture															
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lectures well	prepared	10	0	0	1	1	6	41	4.78	412/1440	4.78	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.78
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem interested i	n the subject	10	0	0	0	1	3	45	4.90	521/1448	4.90	4.64	4.71	4.71	4.90
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presented and e	xplained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	11	37	4.73	326/1436	4.73	4.18	4.29	4.30	4.73
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to what	you learned	11	0	0	0	0	9	39	4.81	280/1432	4.81	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.81
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques enhance y	our understanding	11	2	1	0	7	11	27	4.37	387/1221	4.37	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.37
1 5'1 1		Discussion		4.0	0	0	-	-	0	•	4 55		****	4 00	4 10	4 1 4	****
		ussions contribute to		48	0	0	1 1	1	0	9		****/1280		4.09	4.10	4.14	****
		nts actively encourage		49	0	0	0	_	0	8		****/1277 ****/1269		4.35	4.34	4.38	****
		ctor encourage fair an	a open discussion	49 49	3	0	0	1	1	8 6		****/ 854		4.35	4.31	4.39	****
4. were s	врестат с	echniques successful		49	3	U	U	Т	U	О	4./1	****/ 854	* * * * *	3.94	4.02	4.00	
		Laboratory															
1. Did th	ne lab ind	crease understanding o	f the material	23	0	1	0	2	7	26	4.58	77/ 215	4.58	4.37	4.36	4.21	4.58
2. Were y	you provid	ded with adequate back	ground information	23	0	0	0	1	5	30	4.81	35/ 228	4.81	4.47	4.35	4.29	4.81
		materials available f		23	0	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	39/ 217	4.89	4.48	4.51	4.45	4.89
	_	structor provide assis		23	0	0	1	0	4	31	4.81	58/ 216	4.81	4.41	4.42	4.35	4.81
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab reports cl	early specified	23	10	0	0	1	11	14	4.50	67/ 205	4.50	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.50
5 Were o	riteria 1	Seminar For grading made clear		57	0	0	0	Ο	0	2	5 00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4 11	3.33	****
J. WELE C	JIICCIIA I	or grading made crear		3,	Ü	Ü	Ü	O	Ü	_	3.00	, 00		1.00		3.33	
			Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Omodite T	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra						Des		~			m				Majarra	
crearrs F	its Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra						кеа	ason	.bi 			ту	ре 			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 35		Red	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	50
28-55																	
56-83					Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad !	59	Non-	-major	9
84-150	31	3.00-3.49 17	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 16	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	there a	re not	enoug	h
	Р											respons	es to l	oe sigr	nificar	ıt	
			т 0		O+1	h 0 30				1	0	_					

Other

48

I

0

2

Course-Section:	BIOL 396 0101	University of Maryland	Page 182
Title	UGRAD TCHNG ASSISTANTS	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

6

	Frequencies						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	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.11	4.26	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1497	5.00	3.96	4.11	4.13	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.44	4.45	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.18	4.29	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.18	4.29	4.29	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	279/1221	4.50	4.08	3.93	3.94	4.50

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

Course-Section: BIOL 414 0101

Title EUKARYOTICS GEN/MOL BI

Instructor: FARABAUGH, PHIL

Enrollment: 39

39

Spring 2007
Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 183

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Ouestionnaires: 29 Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 1 11 16 4.45 681/1522 4.45 4.29 4.30 4.42 4.45 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 6 13 10 4.14 996/1522 4.14 4.11 4.26 4.34 4.14 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0
4 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 14 12 4.32 714/1285 4.32 4.01 4.30 4.42 4.32 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 4 12 12 4.29 758/1476 4.29 4.02 4.22 4.31 4.29 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 5 8 9 3.92 865/1412 3.92 4.06 4.06 4.11 3.92 0 3 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 1 0 2 6 10 7 3.88 953/1381 3.88 3.83 4.08 4.21 3.88 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 0 0 2 13 12 4.37 660/1500 4.37 4.09 4.18 4.25 4.37 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 27 5.00 1/1517 5.00 4.73 4.65 4.71 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 1 1 15 7 4.17 756/1497 4.17 3.96 4.11 4.21 4.17 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 1 5 22 4.66 617/1440 4.66 4.44 4.45 4.52 4.66 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 6 23 4.79 783/1448 4.79 4.64 4.71 4.75 4.79 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 7 11 10 4.00 1056/1436 4.00 4.18 4.29 4.32 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 2 6 18 4.31 838/1432 4.31 4.18 4.29 4.34 4.31 0 0 1 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 6 19 4.59 219/1221 4.59 4.08 3.93 4.04 4.59 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 4 6 7 4.00 718/1280 4.00 4.09 4.10 4.28 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 1 2 14 4.61 517/1277 4.61 4.35 4.34 4.50 4.61 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 2 5 11 4.50 586/1269 4.50 4.35 4.31 4.49 4.50 4. Were special techniques successful 1 2 6 8 4.24 341/854 4.24 3.94 4.02 4.31 4.24 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 27 1 Λ 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.37 4.36 4.47 **** 0 2.50 ****/ 228 **** 4.47 4.35 4.32 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0 0 1 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 27 1 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 217 **** 4.48 4.51 4.55 **** 0 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 27 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 216 **** 4.41 4.42 4.20 **** 0 0 1 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 205 **** 4.30 4.23 3.85 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 27 1 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 79 **** 2.00 4.58 4.67 **** 1 4.50 ****/ 77 **** 1.50 4.52 4.60 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 27 0 Ω 1 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 27 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 65 **** 1.00 4.49 4.65 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 80 **** 1.00 4.11 4.14 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.25 4.41 4.51 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 3.00 4.30 4.22 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 27 1 1 5.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.03 **** 0 0 0 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 27 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.13 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 27 1 1 5.00 ****/ 34 **** **** 4.30 4.11 **** Self Paced 1 4.00 ****/ 37 **** 4.67 4.63 4.33 **** 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 27 0 0 0 1 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 27 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 23 **** 3.00 4.41 4.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 27 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.69 4.92 ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 27 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 22 **** 4.67 4.54 4.25 ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 27 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 18 **** 4.67 4.49 4.25 **** Course-Section: BIOL 414 0101

Title

Instructor:

EUKARYOTICS GEN/MOL BI FARABAUGH, PHIL

Enrollment:

39 Questionnaires: 29 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 183 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	11	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	11	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				?	4						

Course-Section: BIOL 420 0101 University of Maryla
Title ADV TOPICS:CELL BIOLOG Baltimore County
Instructor: MCGRAW, PATRICI Spring 2007

University of Maryland Page 184
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

7

Enrollment:	29	
Questionnaires:	13	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I

?

0

1

								_	ncies		_		tructor		-	UMBC		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	1402/1522	3.50	4.29	4.30	4.42	3.50
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	3	2	4	3	3.58	1331/1522	3.58	4.11	4.26	4.34	3.58
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	3	3	5	1	3.33	1210/1285	3.33	4.01	4.30	4.42	3.33
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1169/1476	3.82	4.02	4.22	4.31	3.82
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	6	2	3.64	1094/1412	3.64	4.06	4.06	4.11	3.64
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1130/1381	3.60	3.83	4.08	4.21	3.60
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	0	2	4	2	3	3.55	1283/1500	3.55	4.09	4.18	4.25	3.55
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		3	0	4	3	1	0	2	2.30	1516/1517	2.30	4.73	4.65	4.71	2.30
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	2	7	0	0	2.78	1454/1497	2.78	3.96	4.11	4.21	2.78
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	1	0	7	2	2	3.33	1385/1440	3.33	4.44	4.45	4.52	3.33
					1	0	0	0	2	5	5		1300/1448		4.64	4.71	4.75	4.25
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	r seem interested in the subject ial presented and explained clearly				1	0	6	4	1	3.33	1334/1436	3.33	4.18	4.29	4.32	3.33
		es contribute t			2	0	0	1	2	7	1	3.73	1203/1432	3.73	4.18	4.29	4.34	3.73
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	1	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	759/1221	3.80	4.08	3.93	4.04	3.80
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	988/1280	3.60	4.09	4.10	4.28	3.60
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	2	2	1		1050/1277		4.35	4.34	4.50	3.80
				d open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	2	1		1097/1269		4.35	4.31	4.49	3.60
		echniques succe			9	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.31	****
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	utio	n									
					_			_					_					
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General				2	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	7			
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives					0	#### -				_	gh		
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	

Other

Course-Section: BIOL 428 0101

Title COMPUTER APPL MOLEC BI

Instructor: ONEILL, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 185 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Ο	0	2	2	2	4 00	1122/1522	4.00	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	0		1496/1522	2.83	4.11	4.26	4.34	2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	1	0	0		1279/1285	2.00	4.01	4.30	4.42	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	0		1380/1476	3.25	4.02	4.22	4.31	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	1	0		1398/1412		4.06	4.06	4.11	2.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	1	1		1130/1381	3.60	3.83	4.08	4.21	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	3	0		1411/1500	3.17	4.09	4.18	4.25	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1395/1497	3.17	3.96	4.11	4.21	3.17
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1432/1440	2.33	4.44	4.45	4.52	2.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1393/1448	3.83	4.64	4.71	4.75	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1411/1436	2.67	4.18	4.29	4.32	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1320/1432	3.33	4.18	4.29	4.34	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	4.08	3.93	4.04	3.00
Discussion	-	0	-	•	0	-	-	2 00	1150/1000	2 00	4 00	4 10	4 00	2 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	1		1150/1280	3.20	4.09	4.10	4.28	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	2	1		1171/1277	3.40	4.35	4.34	4.50	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1 1	0 3	1 1	1	1	1 1	1	2.50	1207/1269 832/ 854	3.00 2.50	4.35 3.94	4.31	4.49	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	Τ.	U	U	Т	U	2.50	832/ 854	2.50	3.94	4.02	4.31	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51	4.55	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	3.85	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	1.00	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.14	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									

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

BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY

Title GLUICK, THOMAS

Instructor:

Enrollment: 71 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 186 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	3	9	17	18	4.06	1081/1522	4.06	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	5	12	17	11	3.64	1313/1522	3.64	4.11	4.26	4.34	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	7	14	15	11	3.64	1132/1285	3.64	4.01	4.30	4.42	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	5	14	14	11	3.59	1289/1476	3.59	4.02	4.22	4.31	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	12	12	16	3.86	924/1412	3.86	4.06	4.06	4.11	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	3	5	11	9	8	3.39	1206/1381	3.39	3.83	4.08	4.21	3.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	4	10	16	16	3.96	1038/1500	3.96	4.09	4.18	4.25	3.96
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	46	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	4	13	19	5	3.49	1286/1497	3.49	3.96	4.11	4.21	3.49
T a mb														
Lecture	2	0	3	7	0	20	6	2 12	1271/1440	2 42	1 11	1 1E	4.52	3.42
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	9 6		6 29		1371/1440		4.44	4.45 4.71		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	2	7	-	9	29 2		1190/1448	4.47	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	7	18 11	16	9		1358/1436		4.18			3.20 3.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	3	2	2	5	16			1267/1432		4.18	4.29		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	2	5	19	14	3.98	632/1221	3.98	4.08	3.93	4.04	3.98
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	****/1280	****	4.09	4.10	4.28	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	****/1277	****	4.35	4.34	4.50	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/1269	****	4.35	4.31	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	40	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.31	***
Laboratory	4.		0	•	•	0	-	F 00		als als als als	4 25	4 26	4 45	ate ate ate ate
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 215	****	4.37	4.36	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 228	****	4.47	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 217	****	4.48	4.51	4.55	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 216	****	4.41	4.42	4.20	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	4.30	4.23	3.85	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.14	****
miald massle														
Field Work	47	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	++++/ 17	****	4 05	1 11	A F1	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	1	0	-	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45		3.00	4.30	4.22	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35			4.31	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	4.25	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	4.25	****

Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY

Instructor: GLUICK, THOMAS

Enrollment: 71
Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 186 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	32
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	26						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	48	Non-major	16
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	F 0 Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be signific		gnificant	
				I	0	Other	39				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 434 0101 University of Maryland Page 187 Title MICROBIAL MOLEC GENETI Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007

WOLF, RICHARD E

Instructor: Enrollment: 26

Questionnaires: 23

Spring 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		Frequenc			ncie	s	Ins		ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions				1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
G1															
General	0		0	0	_	0		1	4 65	442/1500	4 65	4 00	4 20	4 40	4 65
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0		0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	443/1522		4.29	4.30	4.42	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0		0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	522/1522	4.52	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0		0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	509/1285	4.52	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0		5	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	566/1476	4.44	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learn			0	1	0	0	5	17	4.61	283/1412	4.61	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you lea		_	11	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	938/1381	3.90	3.83	4.08	4.21	3.90
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	0		0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	232/1500	4.74	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0		0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effective	ness 2		1	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	348/1497	4.55	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.55
Lecture															
				0	٥	0	2	20	4.87	256/1440	4.87	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.87
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared				0	0	0	2	20	4.87	602/1448	4.87	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0		0	0	0	0	10	13		527/1436	4.57	4.18	4.71	4.75	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear	·ly 0 0		0	0	0	1	7.0		4.57						
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				-	0	Τ.	3	19	4.78	316/1432		4.18	4.29	4.34	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				0	Τ	5	5	9	4.10	572/1221	4.10	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.10
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learn	.ed 5		0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.09	4.10	4.28	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participa	te 5		0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	470/1277	4.67	4.35	4.34	4.50	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss			0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	763/1269	4.28	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	5		14	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.31	****
Frequency Distribution															
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr	ades	des			Reasons				Type				Majors		

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	8	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0		responses to be signific		gnificant		
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 443 0101

J10H 115 0101

ADV TOPICS: DEVEL BIOLO

Instructor: BLUMBERG, DAPH (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 188 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	380/1522	4.71	4 29	4.30	4.42	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	465/1522		4.11	4.26	4.34	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2		****/1285		4.01	4.30	4.42	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	473/1476		4.02	4.22	4.31	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	205/1412		4.06	4.06	4.11	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	220/1381	4.64	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	0	9	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1019/1517	4.57	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	633/1497	4.41	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.44	4.45	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1436	4.86	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	200/1221	4.63	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.28	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.35	4.34	4.50	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 854	***	3.94	4.02	4.31	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 78		1.00	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45		3.00	4.30	4.22	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39		****	4.40	4.03	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35		****	4.31	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	***	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13 13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37		4.67	4.63	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 23		3.00	4.41	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33		5.00	4.69	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	4.25	****
Even		. Di	- m d 1a.	.+	_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Ĺ	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6 6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	2	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 7 ?

Course-Section: BIOL 443 0101

ADV TOPICS: DEVEL BIOLO

Title BIEBERICH, CHAR (Instr. B)

Instructor: Enrollment:

14

Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 189 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 380/1522 4.71 4.29 4.30 4.42 4.71 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 465/1522 4.57 4.11 4.26 4.34 4.57 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 12 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1285 **** 4.01 4.30 4.42 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 5 8 4.50 473/1476 4.50 4.02 4.22 4.31 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 205/1412 4.69 4.06 4.06 4.11 4.69 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 220/1381 4.64 3.83 4.08 4.21 4.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 1019/1517 4.57 4.73 4.65 4.71 4.57 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.44 4.45 4.52 5.00				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 380/1522 4.71 4.29 4.30 4.42 4.71 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 465/1522 4.57 4.11 4.26 4.34 4.57 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 12 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1285 **** 4.01 4.30 4.42 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 5 8 4.50 473/1476 4.50 4.02 4.22 4.31 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 205/1412 4.69 4.06 4.06 4.11 4.69 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 220/1381 4.64 3.83 4.08 4.21 4.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 220/1381 4.64 3.83 4.08 4.21 4.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 1019/1517 4.57 4.73 4.65 4.71 4.57 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 355/1497 4.41 3.96 4.11 4.21 4.41 1.25 4.00 1.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4	Questions	NR	NA		_			5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 380/1522 4.71 4.29 4.30 4.42 4.71 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 465/1522 4.57 4.11 4.26 4.34 4.57 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 12 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1285 **** 4.01 4.30 4.42 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 5 8 4.50 473/1476 4.50 4.02 4.22 4.31 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 205/1412 4.69 4.06 4.06 4.11 4.69 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 220/1381 4.64 3.83 4.08 4.21 4.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 220/1381 4.64 3.83 4.08 4.21 4.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 1019/1517 4.57 4.73 4.65 4.71 4.57 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 355/1497 4.41 3.96 4.11 4.21 4.41 1.25 4.00 1.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 465/1522 4.57 4.11 4.26 4.34 4.57 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 12 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1285 **** 4.01 4.30 4.42 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 5 8 4.50 473/1476 4.50 4.02 4.22 4.31 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 205/1412 4.69 4.06 4.06 4.11 4.69 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 220/1381 4.64 3.83 4.08 4.21 4.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 220/1381 4.64 3.83 4.08 4.21 4.64 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 1019/1517 4.57 4.73 4.65 4.71 4.57 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 355/1497 4.41 3.96 4.11 4.21 4.41 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.44 4.45 4.52 5.00	General														
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 12 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1285 **** 4.01 4.30 4.42 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 5 8 4.50 473/1476 4.50 4.02 4.22 4.31 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 205/1412 4.69 4.06 4.06 4.11 4.69 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 220/1381 4.64 3.83 4.08 4.21 4.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 0 3 0 9 4.00 988/1500 4.00 4.09 4.18 4.25 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 1019/1517 4.57 4.73 4.65 4.71 4.57 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 355/1497 4.41 3.96 4.11 4.21 4.41 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.44 4.45 4.52 5.00	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	380/1522	4.71	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 5 8 4.50 473/1476 4.50 4.02 4.22 4.31 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 205/1412 4.69 4.06 4.06 4.11 4.69 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 220/1381 4.64 3.83 4.08 4.21 4.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 0 3 0 9 4.00 988/1500 4.00 4.09 4.18 4.25 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 1019/1517 4.57 4.73 4.65 4.71 4.57 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 355/1497 4.41 3.96 4.11 4.21 4.41 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.44 4.45 4.52 5.00	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	465/1522	4.57	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 2 10 4.69 205/1412 4.69 4.06 4.06 4.11 4.69 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 220/1381 4.64 3.83 4.08 4.21 4.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 0 3 0 9 4.00 988/1500 4.00 4.09 4.18 4.25 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 1019/1517 4.57 4.73 4.65 4.71 4.57 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 355/1497 4.41 3.96 4.11 4.21 4.41 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.44 4.45 4.52 5.00	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.01	4.30	4.42	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 220/1381 4.64 3.83 4.08 4.21 4.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 2 0 3 0 9 4.00 988/1500 4.00 4.09 4.18 4.25 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 1019/1517 4.57 4.73 4.65 4.71 4.57 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 355/1497 4.41 3.96 4.11 4.21 4.41 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.44 4.45 4.52 5.00	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 2 0 3 0 9 4.00 988/1500 4.00 4.09 4.18 4.25 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 1019/1517 4.57 4.73 4.65 4.71 4.57 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 355/1497 4.41 3.96 4.11 4.21 4.41 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.44 4.45 4.52 5.00	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	205/1412	4.69	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 6 8 4.57 1019/1517 4.57 4.73 4.65 4.71 4.57 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 355/1497 4.41 3.96 4.11 4.21 4.41 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.44 4.45 4.52 5.00	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	220/1381	4.64	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0 0 5 6 4.55 355/1497 4.41 3.96 4.11 4.21 4.41 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.44 4.45 4.52 5.00	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	3	0	9	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.00
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.44 4.45 4.52 5.00	8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1019/1517	4.57	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.57
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.44 4.45 4.52 5.00	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	355/1497	4.41	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.41
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1440 5.00 4.44 4.45 4.52 5.00	Lagtuma														
		Ω	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	6	5 00	1/1440	5 00	1 11	4 45	4 52	5 00
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	575/1448	4.88	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 170/1436 4.86 4.18 4.29 4.32 4.86															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 1 2 0 4 4.00 1036/1432 4.00 4.18 4.29 4.34 4.00															
·							-	-		,					
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 0 0 0 1 1 6 4.63 200/1221 4.63 4.08 3.93 4.04 4.63	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	О	U	U	U	1	1	О	4.63	200/1221	4.63	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.03
Discussion	Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1280 5.00 4.09 4.10 4.28 5.00	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.28	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1277 5.00 4.35 4.34 4.50 5.00	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.35	4.34	4.50	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1269 5.00 4.35 4.31 4.49 5.00	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful 3 8 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 **** 854 **** 3.94 4.02 4.31 ****	4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 854	****	3.94	4.02	4.31	****
Seminar	Cominar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 2.00 4.58 4.67 ****		1.0	0	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	****/ 70	****	2 00	/ E0	1 67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention $12 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ $						-	•	2		,					
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 65 **** 1.00 4.49 4.65 ****								1							
							_	7		,					
	<u>.</u>						-	2		,					
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 12 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 1.00 4.11 4.14 ****	5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	U	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	***/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.14	
Field Work	Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 47 **** 4.25 4.41 4.51 ****	1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 45 **** 3.00 4.30 4.22 ****	2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.22	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 13 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.40 4.03 ****	3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 35 **** **** 4.31 4.13 ****	4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	***	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced	Self Daced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 **** 4.67 4.63 4.33 ****		13	Ω	Ω	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	5 00	****/ 27	****	4 67	4 63	4 32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 23 **** 3.00 4.41 4.00 ****										, -					
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 13 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 33 **** 5.00 4.41 4.00 *****	1 1						-	_		, =-					
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 13 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 22 **** 4.67 4.54 4.25 ****						-	-	_		,					
4. was the reedback/tutoring by proctors herpful 15 0 0 0 0 1 5.00/ 22 4.0/ 4.54 4.25	1. was the reemback/tutoring by proctors helpfur	13	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 22		1.0/	4.54	4.43	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Ĺ	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6 6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	12	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	2	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 7 ?

Course-Section: BIOL 445 0101 University of Maryland SIGNAL TRANSDUCTION Baltimore County

Page 190 JUN 26, 2007 Title Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYL (Instr. A)

	1					
Enrollment:	Τ./					
Questionnaires:	21		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncie		_		ructor		Dept		Level	
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did	you gain	new insights, ski	ills fr	om this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	525/1522	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.57
2. Did	the inst	ructor make clear	the ex	kpected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	592/1522	4.48	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.48
3. Did	the exam	questions reflec	ct the	expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	478/1285	4.55	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.55
4. Did	other ev	aluations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	367/1476	4.62	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.62
5. Did	assigned	readings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	101/1412	4.90	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.90
6. Did	written	assignments contr	ribute	to what you learne	d 0	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	713/1381	4.14	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.14
7. Was	the grad	ing system clearl	ly expla	ained	0	0	0	2	4	3	12	4.19	839/1500	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.19
8. How	many tim	es was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How	would yo	u grade the overa	all tea	ching effectivenes	s 2	0	0	0	3	11	5	4.11	833/1497	4.26	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.26
	Lecture																	
1. Wer	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	272/1440	4.90	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.90
2. Did	the inst	ructor seem inter	rested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	765/1448	4.88	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.88
3. Was	lecture	material presente	ed and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	741/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.58
4. Did	the lect	ures contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	669/1432	4.60	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.60
5. Did	audiovis	ual techniques en	nhance :	your understanding	1	2	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	279/1221	4.62	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.62
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did	class di	scussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	179/1280	4.82	4.09	4.10	4.28	4.82
2. Wer	e all stu	dents actively en	ncourage	ed to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.35	4.34	4.50	4.92
3. Did	the inst	ructor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.49	5.00
4. Wer	e special	techniques succe	essful		9	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	117/ 854	4.73	3.94	4.02	4.31	4.73
	Fred					/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade					a			P.O.	ason	a			Ту	20			Majors	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades										.a 				 be				, . – – – –
00-27		0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	3	Majo	r	18
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2													TT3		_			_

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	С	3	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 445 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County SIGNAL TRANSDUCTION

Page 191 Title JUN 26, 2007 Instructor: EISENMANN, DAVI (Instr. B) Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	17			
Questionnaires:	21	Student Cour	rse Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	525/1522	4.57	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	592/1522	4.48	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	478/1285	4.55	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	367/1476	4.62	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	101/1412	4.90	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	713/1381	4.14	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	3	12	4.19	839/1500	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	493/1497	4.26	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	115/1440	4.90	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	296/1448	4.88	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	263/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	383/1432	4.60	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	134/1221	4.62	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	179/1280	4.82	4.09	4.10	4.28	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.35	4.34	4.50	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful			0	0	1	1	9	4.73	117/ 854	4.73	3.94	4.02	4.31	4.73
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Expected Grades Reason			Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 454 0101 University of Maryland VISION SCIENCE Baltimore County

Enrollment:

7

Page 192 Title JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYL (Instr. A) Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 7	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
-------------------	---

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

		Ouestions	-		MD	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level	Sect Mean
		Question	j 		NIX.	NA				- 1		меан	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain nev	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	380/1522	4.71	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.71
_	_	or make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	465/1522	4.57	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.57
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	456/1285	4.57	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.57
4. Did oth	ner evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.00
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	299/1412	4.57	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.57
6. Did wri	itten ass:	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	575/1381	4.29	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.29
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	600/1500	4.43	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.43
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.71	
9. How wou	uld you gi	rade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	481/1497	4.57	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.57
		Lecture	2															
1 Were th	ne instru	nrenared	Λ	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	532/1440	4.79	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.79		
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject								0	0	7		1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.75	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0 0	0	0	1	2		4.43	696/1436	4.50	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.50
		s contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	1	6		227/1432	4.93	4.18	4.29		4.93
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	232/1221		4.08	3.93		4.64
		-	_															
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	624/1280	4.20	4.09	4.10	4.28	4.20
		_	_	d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.35	4.34	4.50	5.00
		_		d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1269	4.60	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.60
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succes	ssful		3	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	3.94	4.02	4.31	5.00
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	cribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	; 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2						quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	\$	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 1						Ger	neral	L				4	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	1
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0																		
Grad.		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh				

Other

3

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Course-Section: BIOL 454 0101 VISION SCIENCE Baltimore County

Page 193 Title JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS (Instr. B) Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 7	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
-------------------	---

?

0

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5					Inst	structor Course Dep		Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	380/1522	4.71	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.71
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	465/1522	4.57	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.57
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	456/1285	4.57	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.57
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	299/1412	4.57	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.57
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	575/1381	4.29	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.29
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	600/1500	4.43	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.43
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	600/1517	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.86
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	223/1497	4.57	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.57
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1440	4.79	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.79
2. Did th	e instru	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.75	5.00		
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	514/1436	4.50	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.50
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1432	4.93	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.93
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	144/1221	4.64	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.64
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	624/1280	4.20	4.09	4.10	4.28	4.20
2. Were a	ill stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.35	4.34	4.50	5.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	509/1269	4.60	4.35	4.31	4.49	4.60
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		3	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	3.94	4.02	4.31	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	'arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pe:	asons	2			Ty	ne			Majors	2
										- 								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4		_							1		_			_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Gei	nera:	L				4	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1				_	jn
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	niican	1T	
				I 0		Other						3						

Course-Section: BIOL 456 0101 University of Maryland Page 194 Title PLANT MOLECULAR BIOLOG Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007

Instructor: LU, HUA (Instr. A) Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quescionni	laires.	10		Scudenc Coc	irse	Буат	uati	OII Q	uesci	LOIII	alle	-						
							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions General gain new insights, skills from this cour instructor make clear the expected goal exam questions reflect the expected goal er evaluations reflect the expected goal igned readings contribute to what you letten assignments contribute to what you grading system clearly explained y times was class cancelled ld you grade the overall teaching effect Lecture enstructor's lectures well prepared instructor seem interested in the subjecture material presented and explained clectures contribute to what you learned iovisual techniques enhance your underst Discussion so discussions contribute to what you learned instructor encourage fair and open discustions actively encouraged to particular instructor encourage fair and open discuscial techniques successful The Cum. GPA Expected O 0.00-0.99 1 A O 1.00-1.99 0 B		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		General																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.75
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1006/1522	4.13	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.13
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect	t the e	expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.50
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	357/1476	4.63	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.63
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	214/1412	4.69	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.69
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	470/1381	4.38	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.38
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	660/1500	4.38	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.38
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	555/1517	4.88	4.73	4.65	4.71	4.88
9. How wo	ould you	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	8	3	3.93	993/1497	4.07	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.07		
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture:	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1440	4.82	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.82
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	395/1448	4.93	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.93
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	d and	explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	845/1436	4.46	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.46
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	2	0	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	1036/1432	4.11	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.11
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	175/1221	4.70	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.70
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.28	5.00
2. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.35	4.34	4.50	4.71
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage :	fair a	nd open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.49	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful	-	9	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	380/ 854	4.17	3.94	4.02	4.31	4.17
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Carned	Expected Grades	Reasons Type							Majors	5							
	 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 5						Required for Majors 0 Graduate 3 Majo							13				
						ĸe.	quir	ea I	OT Mg	JUL	Ö	U	Graduat	E	J	Ma J	JΤ	13
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		General 6 Under-grad 13					Non	-major	3					
84-150						GE.	iici d	Τ.				U	onder -g	Lau I	J	11011-	ilia JUL	3
							oat i	a				1	####	Moona +	horo o	ro not	ono	rh
Grad.	3	H U		ъT	ecti	ves				Τ.	#### - 1	means t	mere a	re not	. enoug	jll		

Other

8

responses to be significant

Ρ

I

0

Course-Section: BIOL 456 0101 University of Maryland Title PLANT MOLECULAR BIOLOG Baltimore County Instructor: MILLER, STEPHEN (Instr. B) Spring 2007

rsity of Maryland Page 195 ltimore County JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	20		
Questionnaires:	16	Student Course Evaluation Questionnai:	re

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

		Ouestion	g			MD	NA	Fre	_	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
		Quescion:	5 										Mean		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1																
1. Did you	u qain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this cours	e	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.29	4.30	4.42	4.75
2. Did the	e instruct	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	}	0	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	1006/1522	4.13	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.13
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflect	t the e	expected goal	.s	1	3	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.01	4.30	4.42	4.50
4. Did oth	her evalua	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	;	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	357/1476	4.63	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.63
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you lea	rned	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	214/1412	4.69	4.06	4.06	4.11	4.69
6. Did wri	itten ass:	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you l	earned	0	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	470/1381	4.38	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.38
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined		0	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	660/1500	4.38	4.09	4.18	4.25	4.38
	-	was class cance				0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	555/1517		4.73	4.65		4.88
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effecti	veness	1	0	0	1	1	7	6	4.20	718/1497	4.07	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.07
1. Were th	he instru	Lecture ctor's lectures		2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	272/1440	4.82	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.82		
2. Did the		!t	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	395/1448		4.64		4.75	4.93			
3. Was led	cture mate	erial presented	d and e	explained cle	arly	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	436/1436	4.46	4.18	4.29	4.32	4.46
4. Did the	e lectures	s contribute to	o what	you learned	-	2	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	914/1432	4.11	4.18	4.29	4.34	4.11
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	hance y	our understa	nding	4	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	139/1221	4.70	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.70
		Discus	gion																
1 Did cla	agg digam	ssions contrib		what you lea	rned	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.28	5.00
		ts actively en		_		9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.35	4.34	4.50	4.71
		tor encourage	_	_	_	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.49	5.00
		chniques succes		- or		9	1	0	0	1	3		4.17	380/ 854		3.94		4.31	
					Frequ	encv	nigt	trib	nt i on	n									
					rrequ	CIICy	DIS	CIID	ac101										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 5						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 r	13
28-55	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 9										-						_		
56-83	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 1						Ger	nera:	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-major		3
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 1 D 0																			
Grad.								Electives 1 #### - Means there are n					re not	enoug	jh				

Other

8

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101

SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS

Title

Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 196 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84			4.29	4.30	4.42	4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	7	11	4.42	670/1522	4.42	4.11	4.26	4.34	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	650/1285	4.40	4.01	4.30		4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7		4.53	454/1476	4.53	4.02			4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	3	7	5	3.94	852/1412	3.94	4.06	4.06	4.11	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	314/1381	4.53	3.83	4.08	4.21	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	924/1500	4.12	4.09		4.25	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	370/1497	4.53	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.53
Lecture	1	0	^	^	0	4	1 -	4 70	200/1440	4 70	4 4 4	4 45	4 50	4 70
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0			4.79	392/1440	4.79	4.44	4.45	4.52	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	•	-	1	18	4.95	296/1448	4.95	4.64	4.71	4.75	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6		4.58	514/1436	4.58	4.18	4.29		4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	174/1432	4.89	4.18	4.29		4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	U	0	3	15	4.83	92/1221	4.83	4.08	3.93	4.04	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	337/1280	4.58	4.09	4.10	4.28	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/1277	4.92	4.35	4.34	4.50	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	200/1269	4.92	4.35	4.31		4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	2	8		153/ 854		3.94	4.02		4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	U	U		4	0	4.04	155/ 654	4.04	3.74	4.02	4.31	4.04
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	116/ 215	4.38	4.37	4.36	4.47	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	154/ 228	4.25	4.47	4.35	4.32	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	41/ 217	4.88	4.48	4.51	4.55	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	3	5		100/ 216	4.63	4.41	4.42	4.20	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	2	0	1	5		135/ 205	4.13	4.30			4.13
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specifical	12	0	U	2	U	_	,	1.13	133/ 203	1.13	1.50	1.25	3.03	1.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.65	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 80	****	1.00		4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.22	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.03	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.13	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.30	4.11	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.67	4.63	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.67	4.54	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	4.67	4.49	4.25	***

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101

Title SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS

Instructor: FR

FREELAND, STEPH

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 196 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons	Reasons Type				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II

Title

Instructor: Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 9

WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)

Page 197 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Ouestions	NR	NΙΔ	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
Žucaciona														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522		4.29	4.30	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.11	4.26	4.29	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.01	4.30	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	207/1476	4.78	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.06	4.06	4.25	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7		136/1381	4.78	3.83	4.08	4.25	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9		1/1500	5.00	4.09	4.18	4.22	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0 2	9		1/1517		4.73		4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	U	2	/	4.78	172/1497	4.50	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1440	4.90	4.44	4.45	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	141/1436	4.84	4.18	4.29	4.37	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	187/1432	4.84	4.18	4.29	4.33	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1221	4.90	4.08	3.93	3.83	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.35	4.34	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	106/ 854	4.75	3.94	4.02	4.08	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	4.37	4 36	4.72	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 228	5.00	4.47	4.35	4.39	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/ 217	5.00		4.51	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	4.41		4.76	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 205	5.00	4.30	4.23	4.40	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.76	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.71	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.66	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.38	****
Field Work														
	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4 40	****
 Did field experience contribute to what you learned Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	3.00	4.41	4.40 4.49	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	3.UU ****	4.40	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	****	4.31	4.71	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 34	****	****	4.31	4.71	****
5. 222 Someteness help you carry out rich activities	J	J	5	5	5	5	_	3.00	, 51			1.50	1.02	
Self Paced	_				_		_							
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.67	4.63	4.82	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	4.68	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.79	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	14/ 22	4.67	4.67	4.54	4.83	4.67
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	10/ 18	4.67	4.67	4.49	4.92	4.67

Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II

Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 9 Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 197 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А			0	Graduate	2	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	7	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 198

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	Frequencies			Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	I.evre l	Sect	
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2 2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.45	5.00
O Did the instructor make along the concepted week	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	г оо	1 11	1 00	4 20	5.00
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1522	5.00 5.00	4.11	4.26	4.29 4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	207/1476	4.78	4.01	4.22	4.31	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.70	339/1412	4.70	4.02	4.22	4.25	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	136/1381	4.78	3.83	4.08	4.25	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.09	4.18	4.22	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.73	4.65	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	-	4.33	573/1497	4.56	3.96	4.11	4.73	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	U	0	3	4.33	5/3/149/	4.50	3.90	4.11	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1440	4.90	4.44	4.45	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1436	4.84	4.18	4.29	4.37	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1432	4.84	4.18	4.29	4.33	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	99/1221	4.90	4.08	3.93	3.83	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.09	4.10	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.35	4.34	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.35	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	106/ 854	4.75	3.94	4.02	4.08	4.75
T all and the same														
Laboratory	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	г оо	1 / 015	г оо	4 27	1 20	4 70	F 00
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	4.37	4.36	4.72	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	7 7	5.00	1/ 228	5.00 5.00	4.47	4.35	4.39	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	-	7	5.00	1/ 217			4.51	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 216 1/ 205	5.00 5.00	4.41	4.42	4.76 4.40	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	۷	U	U	U	U	U	/	5.00	1/ 205	5.00	4.30	4.23	4.40	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	2.00	4.58	4.76	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	1.50	4.52	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.49	4.71	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	1.00	4.45	4.66	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	1.00	4.11	4.38	****
Field Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	F 00		ale ale ale ale	4 05	4 41	4 40	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.25	4.41	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.49	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.40	4.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35 ****/ 34	****	****	4.31	4.71	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	ŏ	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 34			4.30	4.82	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.67	4.63	4.82	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 23	****	3.00	4.41	4.68	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.79	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	14/ 22	4.67		4.54	4.83	4.67
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	10/ 18	4.67	4.67	4.49	4.92	4.67

Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

9 Enrollment: Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 198 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	rned Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	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	7	Non-major	9		
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0								
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to	responses to be significant				
				I	0	Other	8						
				?	1								

Course-Section: BIOL 654 0101 University of Maryland VISION SCIENCE Baltimore County

Title Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYL (Instr. A) Spring 2007

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 2 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies				3		Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1365/1522	3.50	4.11	4.26	4.29	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.01	4.30	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.06	4.06	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1152/1381	3.50	3.83	4.08	4.25	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.09	4.18	4.22	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.73	4.65	4.73	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	898/1497	4.25	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1359/1440	4.00	4.44	4.45	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1056/1436	4.25	4.18	4.29	4.37	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1432	4.75	4.18	4.29	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1165/1221	3.25	4.08	3.93	3.83	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3 00	1187/1280	3.00	4.09	4.10	4.24	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.35	4.34	4.52	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	3.94	4.02	4.08	3.00

Page 199

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	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	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough				
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	1					
				?	0							

Course-Section: BIOL 654 0101 University of Maryland VISION SCIENCE Baltimore County

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

4

Page 200 Title JUN 26, 2007 Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS (Instr. B) Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies						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	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.29	4.30	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1365/1522	3.50	4.11	4.26	4.29	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.01	4.30	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.02	4.22	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.06	4.06	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1152/1381	3.50	3.83	4.08	4.25	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.09	4.18	4.22	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.73	4.65	4.73	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.25	3.96	4.11	4.21	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	798/1440	4.00	4.44	4.45	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.64	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	601/1436	4.25	4.18	4.29	4.37	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	4.75	4.18	4.29	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	606/1221	3.25	4.08	3.93	3.83	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	Ο	0	2	Ο	0	3 00	1187/1280	3.00	4.09	4.10	4.24	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.35	4.34	4.52	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.35	4.31	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	779/ 854		3.94	4.02	4.08	3.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	0 Graduate		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	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	#### - Means there are not enough		L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Λ						