

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	10	12	30	75	85	4.00	1183/1649	4.24	4.16	4.28	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	10	17	40	67	77	3.87	1254/1648	4.16	3.98	4.23	4.16	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	13	16	37	62	84	3.89	1044/1375	4.12	3.97	4.27	4.10	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	61	7	24	31	50	40	3.61	1372/1595	3.84	3.99	4.20	4.03	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	3	3	9	30	50	114	4.28	604/1533	4.01	3.81	4.04	3.87	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	73	13	12	26	33	50	3.71	1149/1512	3.71	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	13	19	48	60	70	3.74	1281/1623	4.07	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	1	2	121	84	4.38	1302/1646	4.69	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	62	4	10	10	39	68	28	3.61	1302/1621	3.97	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	3	8	16	40	140	4.48	891/1568	4.65	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	2	5	14	29	157	4.61	1133/1572	4.73	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	13	11	45	62	71	3.83	1262/1564	4.24	4.06	4.28	4.20	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	16	13	34	55	87	3.90	1201/1559	4.30	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	0	13	16	33	51	87	3.91	805/1352	4.21	4.02	3.98	3.86	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	14	16	29	55	85	3.91	886/1384	4.18	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	5	11	25	56	102	4.20	864/1382	4.26	4.01	4.29	4.03	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	6	12	36	45	99	4.11	920/1368	4.14	3.99	4.30	4.01	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	35	9	17	33	48	56	3.77	596/ 948	3.91	3.64	3.95	3.75	3.77	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	207	8	2	2	0	2	0	2.33	****/ 221	****	4.36	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	209	0	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	****/ 243	****	4.39	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	209	6	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	****/ 212	****	4.56	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	210	5	1	2	2	2	0	2.83	****/ 209	****	4.50	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	198	5	1	1	3	2	11	4.17	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	208	6	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	213	2	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	213	3	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	213	2	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	205	3	2	3	2	5	1	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	215	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	217	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	217	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	217	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	200	0	1	4	2	13	1	3.43	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	215	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	214	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	214	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	215	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	213	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL  
 Enrollment: 282  
 Questionnaires: 221

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 170  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	57	0.00-0.99	10	A	30	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	54
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	78						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	8	C	63	General	1	Under-grad	221	Non-major	167
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D	7						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	172				
				?	9						

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0201  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN  
 Enrollment: 211  
 Questionnaires: 136

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 171  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	2	1	12	32	81	4.48	683/1649	4.24	4.16	4.28	4.11	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	2	11	39	76	4.45	643/1648	4.16	3.98	4.23	4.16	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	3	6	10	34	76	4.35	723/1375	4.12	3.97	4.27	4.10	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	50	4	5	11	17	39	4.08	1027/1595	3.84	3.99	4.20	4.03	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	31	8	7	21	26	34	3.74	1084/1533	4.01	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	91	5	2	7	7	12	3.58	****/1512	3.71	3.83	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	1	5	10	36	75	4.41	635/1623	4.07	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	1	126	4.99	67/1646	4.69	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.99	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	33	1	1	1	5	50	45	4.34	583/1621	3.97	3.86	4.06	3.96	4.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	1	1	14	107	4.81	372/1568	4.65	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	0	2	10	111	4.85	715/1572	4.73	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	1	5	26	91	4.65	486/1564	4.24	4.06	4.28	4.20	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	5	19	99	4.71	448/1559	4.30	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	3	1	13	21	85	4.50	312/1352	4.21	4.02	3.98	3.86	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	5	1	8	23	74	4.44	499/1384	4.18	3.91	4.08	3.86	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	3	6	14	18	70	4.32	790/1382	4.26	4.01	4.29	4.03	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	4	6	15	26	59	4.18	881/1368	4.14	3.99	4.30	4.01	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	24	2	4	18	24	37	4.06	420/ 948	3.91	3.64	3.95	3.75	4.06	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	132	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.36	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	132	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.39	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	132	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.56	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	132	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.50	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	123	2	0	1	4	0	6	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	132	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	132	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	132	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	132	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	129	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	133	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	132	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	132	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	132	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	130	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	131	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	131	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	131	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	131	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	131	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0201  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN  
 Enrollment: 211  
 Questionnaires: 136

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 171  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	4	A	38	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	1	Major	22
28-55	17	1.00-1.99	0	B	40						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C	17	General	2	Under-grad	135	Non-major	114
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	70				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 172  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	1	9	3	5	3.18	1576/1649	3.41	4.16	4.28	4.11	3.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	8	3	6	3.36	1538/1648	3.40	3.98	4.23	4.16	3.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	6	5	6	4	3.27	1275/1375	3.41	3.97	4.27	4.10	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	6	6	4	3	2.91	1554/1595	3.31	3.99	4.20	4.03	2.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	6	6	6	3.67	1139/1533	3.47	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	4	7	4	3.14	1410/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	3	3	6	7	3.62	1342/1623	3.62	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	897/1646	4.73	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	3	6	3	1	2.75	1561/1621	3.03	3.86	4.06	3.96	2.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	3	3	7	4	3.42	1476/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	3.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	1	3	3	10	3.95	1480/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64	3.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	4	9	3	3.40	1427/1564	3.56	4.06	4.28	4.20	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	2	3	6	4	3.33	1424/1559	3.13	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	2	3	3	6	3	3.29	1146/1352	3.37	4.02	3.98	3.86	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	3	1	3	4	3.14	1232/1384	3.09	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	4	2	3	1	4	2.93	1338/1382	3.21	4.01	4.29	4.03	2.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	5	1	2	4	2	2.79	1328/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	2.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	2	2	3	0	3	3.00	844/ 948	2.92	3.64	3.95	3.75	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	129/ 221	3.88	4.36	4.16	4.05	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	169/ 243	4.06	4.39	4.12	4.08	3.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	1	0	3	9	4.29	130/ 212	4.43	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	2	0	0	4	8	4.14	146/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.14	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	4	1	2	2	5	3.21	486/ 555	3.73	4.17	4.29	4.14	3.21	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 288	3.45	3.63	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101  
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 172  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0102  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 173  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	3	8	6	0	2.85	1625/1649	3.41	4.16	4.28	4.11	2.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	9	3	1	2.80	1612/1648	3.40	3.98	4.23	4.16	2.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	8	3	3	1	2.35	1369/1375	3.41	3.97	4.27	4.10	2.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	3	9	3	1	2.70	1574/1595	3.31	3.99	4.20	4.03	2.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	5	6	2	3.05	1432/1533	3.47	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	5	6	1	2.89	1460/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	2.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	7	2	4	3.05	1528/1623	3.62	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	1325/1646	4.73	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	4	2	7	1	0	2.36	1601/1621	3.03	3.86	4.06	3.96	2.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	2	7	7	1	3.05	1512/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	3.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	2	3	7	4	3.37	1545/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64	3.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	6	2	6	0	2.56	1544/1564	3.56	4.06	4.28	4.20	2.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	10	1	4	2	1	2.06	1548/1559	3.13	4.06	4.29	4.20	2.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	3	2	8	4	0	2.76	1275/1352	3.37	4.02	3.98	3.86	2.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	2	0	1	2.33	1355/1384	3.09	3.91	4.08	3.86	2.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	3	1	0	1	2.50	1363/1382	3.21	4.01	4.29	4.03	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	1	3	0	1	2.57	1344/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	2.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	931/ 948	2.92	3.64	3.95	3.75	2.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	2	4	9	1	3.41	199/ 221	3.88	4.36	4.16	4.05	3.41	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	0	5	6	4	3.59	201/ 243	4.06	4.39	4.12	4.08	3.59	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	146/ 212	4.43	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.13	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	121/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	3	4	2	4	3	3.00	490/ 555	3.73	4.17	4.29	4.14	3.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.45	3.63	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0104  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 174  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	1236/1649	3.41	4.16	4.28	4.11	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	8	2	3.53	1474/1648	3.40	3.98	4.23	4.16	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	5	4	3.35	1255/1375	3.41	3.97	4.27	4.10	3.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	6	4	3	3.38	1456/1595	3.31	3.99	4.20	4.03	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	5	1	5	4	3.38	1326/1533	3.47	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	5	0	6	3.47	1287/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1234/1623	3.62	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	714/1646	4.73	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	4	6	0	3.60	1302/1621	3.03	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	636/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	1146/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	1127/1564	3.56	4.06	4.28	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	1	4	4	3.38	1412/1559	3.13	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	650/1352	3.37	4.02	3.98	3.86	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	1	3	1	3.00	1254/1384	3.09	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	3	1	1	2.88	1345/1382	3.21	4.01	4.29	4.03	2.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	1316/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	2.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	905/ 948	2.92	3.64	3.95	3.75	2.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	112/ 221	3.88	4.36	4.16	4.05	4.23	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	76/ 243	4.06	4.39	4.12	4.08	4.46	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	97/ 212	4.43	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	125/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.36	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	1	2	0	8	3.85	440/ 555	3.73	4.17	4.29	4.14	3.85	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 288	3.45	3.63	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	



Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0104  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 174  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0105  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 175  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	1	7	4	2	3.06	1598/1649	3.41	4.16	4.28	4.11	3.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	4	4	2	2.88	1607/1648	3.40	3.98	4.23	4.16	2.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	5	4	2	2.94	1336/1375	3.41	3.97	4.27	4.10	2.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	4	5	3	3.18	1507/1595	3.31	3.99	4.20	4.03	3.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	2	3	6	1	2.88	1480/1533	3.47	3.81	4.04	3.87	2.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	5	5	1	2.94	1446/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	2.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	5	4	3.47	1401/1623	3.62	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	897/1646	4.73	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	4	1	9	2	0	2.56	1581/1621	3.03	3.86	4.06	3.96	2.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	0	6	3	4	3.18	1503/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	3.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	2	3	6	4	3.47	1539/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64	3.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	4	4	4	2	2.88	1521/1564	3.56	4.06	4.28	4.20	2.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	6	2	0	2.47	1530/1559	3.13	4.06	4.29	4.20	2.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	5	1	2	4	3	2.93	1246/1352	3.37	4.02	3.98	3.86	2.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1202/1384	3.09	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1233/1382	3.21	4.01	4.29	4.03	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	0	1	4	2	3.20	1266/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	3.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	2	2	4	0	0	2.25	929/ 948	2.92	3.64	3.95	3.75	2.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	129/ 221	3.88	4.36	4.16	4.05	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	180/ 243	4.06	4.39	4.12	4.08	3.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	2	0	4	6	4.17	142/ 212	4.43	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.17	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	137/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.27	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	3	0	5	3	3.50	470/ 555	3.73	4.17	4.29	4.14	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	3.45	3.63	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0105  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 175  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 17 Non-major 14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other 12	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0106  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 176  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	2	4	4	2	2.88	1622/1649	3.41	4.16	4.28	4.11	2.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	5	3	2	2.94	1601/1648	3.40	3.98	4.23	4.16	2.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	6	4	2	3.06	1323/1375	3.41	3.97	4.27	4.10	3.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	5	2	3	3	2.88	1557/1595	3.31	3.99	4.20	4.03	2.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	5	3	2	2.94	1465/1533	3.47	3.81	4.04	3.87	2.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	5	3	4	1	2.93	1452/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	2.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	4	4	3.40	1434/1623	3.62	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	1	0	4	9	4.27	1391/1646	4.73	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	2	3	2	0	2.75	1561/1621	3.03	3.86	4.06	3.96	2.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	1279/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	1483/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64	3.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	3	8	1	3.43	1419/1564	3.56	4.06	4.28	4.20	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	5	2	3	2.93	1495/1559	3.13	4.06	4.29	4.20	2.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1143/1352	3.37	4.02	3.98	3.86	3.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1143/1384	3.09	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	3	2	4	1	3.30	1259/1382	3.21	4.01	4.29	4.03	3.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	2	2	2	2	3.00	1286/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	2	4	1	1	2.89	882/ 948	2.92	3.64	3.95	3.75	2.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	171/ 221	3.88	4.36	4.16	4.05	3.79	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	169/ 243	4.06	4.39	4.12	4.08	3.93	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	105/ 212	4.43	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	146/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.14	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	420/ 555	3.73	4.17	4.29	4.14	3.93	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	253/ 288	3.45	3.63	3.68	3.54	2.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0106  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 176  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0107  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 177  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	7	3	5	3.69	1415/1649	3.41	4.16	4.28	4.11	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	4	3	3.31	1552/1648	3.40	3.98	4.23	4.16	3.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	5	4	3	4	3.38	1250/1375	3.41	3.97	4.27	4.10	3.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	6	2	4	3	3.13	1522/1595	3.31	3.99	4.20	4.03	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	5	4	3.63	1166/1533	3.47	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	3	6	2	3	3.36	1338/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1234/1623	3.62	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.73	4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	7	3	2	3.58	1310/1621	3.03	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	956/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	1352/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1096/1564	3.56	4.06	4.28	4.20	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1226/1559	3.13	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	690/1352	3.37	4.02	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1181/1384	3.09	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	1187/1382	3.21	4.01	4.29	4.03	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	3	1	3	0	3.00	1286/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	890/ 948	2.92	3.64	3.95	3.75	2.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	196/ 221	3.88	4.36	4.16	4.05	3.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	204/ 243	4.06	4.39	4.12	4.08	3.56	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	99/ 212	4.43	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	151/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	3	0	3	2	2	3.00	490/ 555	3.73	4.17	4.29	4.14	3.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	3.45	3.63	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	0			
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	6			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0			
			Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
			General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
			Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	12	
?	1			

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0201  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 178  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	6	7	3.83	1327/1649	3.41	4.16	4.28	4.11	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	643/1648	3.40	3.98	4.23	4.16	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	5	5	3.76	1107/1375	3.41	3.97	4.27	4.10	3.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1032/1595	3.31	3.99	4.20	4.03	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	2	4	7	3.82	996/1533	3.47	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	4	6	3.59	1214/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	541/1623	3.62	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	4.73	4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	1	2	6	1	3.45	1375/1621	3.03	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	827/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	3	2	11	4.29	1387/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	5	6	3.88	1229/1564	3.56	4.06	4.28	4.20	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	5	0	7	3.44	1396/1559	3.13	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	7	0	1	6	3	2.88	1260/1352	3.37	4.02	3.98	3.86	2.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1137/1384	3.09	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	1265/1382	3.21	4.01	4.29	4.03	3.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1154/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	905/ 948	2.92	3.64	3.95	3.75	2.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	1	3	1	2	4	3.45	196/ 221	3.88	4.36	4.16	4.05	3.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	53/ 243	4.06	4.39	4.12	4.08	4.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 212	4.43	4.56	4.40	4.43	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	119/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	277/ 555	3.73	4.17	4.29	4.14	4.64	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 288	3.45	3.63	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	



Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0201  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 178  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0202  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 179  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	5	5	6	3.65	1436/1649	3.41	4.16	4.28	4.11	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	6	6	3.70	1382/1648	3.40	3.98	4.23	4.16	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	840/1375	3.41	3.97	4.27	4.10	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	10	5	4.11	996/1595	3.31	3.99	4.20	4.03	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	6	5	6	4.00	815/1533	3.47	3.81	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	6	7	3	3.56	1234/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	7	7	4.00	1029/1623	3.62	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	664/1646	4.73	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	6	3	0	3.33	1429/1621	3.03	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	6	8	4.16	1198/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.16	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	1445/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	8	6	4.00	1127/1564	3.56	4.06	4.28	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	2	5	4	3	3.12	1466/1559	3.13	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	0	6	5	5	3.61	996/1352	3.37	4.02	3.98	3.86	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	1202/1384	3.09	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1146/1382	3.21	4.01	4.29	4.03	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1260/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	776/ 948	2.92	3.64	3.95	3.75	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	51/ 221	3.88	4.36	4.16	4.05	4.62	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	76/ 243	4.06	4.39	4.12	4.08	4.46	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	92/ 212	4.43	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.62	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	93/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.58	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	284/ 555	3.73	4.17	4.29	4.14	4.58	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	52/ 288	3.45	3.63	3.68	3.54	4.40	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0202  
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 179  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0203  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 180  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	7	3	5	0	2.87	1623/1649	3.41	4.16	4.28	4.11	2.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	4	1	3.00	1591/1648	3.40	3.98	4.23	4.16	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	5	1	3.20	1296/1375	3.41	3.97	4.27	4.10	3.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	7	2	1	2.93	1550/1595	3.31	3.99	4.20	4.03	2.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	4	2	3.21	1381/1533	3.47	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	5	2	2	3.00	1428/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	0	2	5	3	3.21	1493/1623	3.62	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	1130/1646	4.73	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	6	2	0	2.90	1535/1621	3.03	3.86	4.06	3.96	2.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1333/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	5	1	7	4.15	1432/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.15	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	5	4	1	3.23	1464/1564	3.56	4.06	4.28	4.20	3.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	4	1	4	3.15	1458/1559	3.13	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	3	3	3	3.64	986/1352	3.37	4.02	3.98	3.86	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1254/1384	3.09	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1356/1382	3.21	4.01	4.29	4.03	2.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1266/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	3.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 948	2.92	3.64	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	186/ 221	3.88	4.36	4.16	4.05	3.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	155/ 243	4.06	4.39	4.12	4.08	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	105/ 212	4.43	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	186/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	338/ 555	3.73	4.17	4.29	4.14	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0204  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 181  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	9	5	4	3.63	1450/1649	3.41	4.16	4.28	4.11	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	4	6	3.42	1517/1648	3.40	3.98	4.23	4.16	3.42	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	5	5	3.56	1188/1375	3.41	3.97	4.27	4.10	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	2	5	6	3.56	1384/1595	3.31	3.99	4.20	4.03	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	781/1533	3.47	3.81	4.04	3.87	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	4	6	3	3.41	1314/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	1029/1623	3.62	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.73	4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	6	3	1	3.17	1473/1621	3.03	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	1248/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	1486/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64	3.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	1	1	6	4	3.64	1344/1564	3.56	4.06	4.28	4.20	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	4	2	1	2	3	2.83	1510/1559	3.13	4.06	4.29	4.20	2.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	1049/1352	3.37	4.02	3.98	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1122/1384	3.09	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1382	3.21	4.01	4.29	4.03	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1206/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	281/ 948	2.92	3.64	3.95	3.75	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	112/ 221	3.88	4.36	4.16	4.05	4.23	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	117/ 243	4.06	4.39	4.12	4.08	4.31	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	62/ 212	4.43	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.77	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	52/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	3	1	5	4	3.77	450/ 555	3.73	4.17	4.29	4.14	3.77	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	3.45	3.63	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0205  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 182  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	1295/1649	3.41	4.16	4.28	4.11	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	8	4	4.00	1124/1648	3.40	3.98	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	901/1375	3.41	3.97	4.27	4.10	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	11	2	3.93	1161/1595	3.31	3.99	4.20	4.03	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	9	4	3.94	885/1533	3.47	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	8	2	3.60	1202/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	8	3	3.81	1234/1623	3.62	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	913/1646	4.73	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	8	4	0	3.07	1492/1621	3.03	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	1070/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	1241/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	812/1564	3.56	4.06	4.28	4.20	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	931/1559	3.13	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	2	8	1	3.67	970/1352	3.37	4.02	3.98	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	1	3	0	3.00	1254/1384	3.09	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	1	3	0	3.17	1298/1382	3.21	4.01	4.29	4.03	3.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1229/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	2.92	3.64	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	107/ 221	3.88	4.36	4.16	4.05	4.27	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	142/ 243	4.06	4.39	4.12	4.08	4.18	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	140/ 212	4.43	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.18	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	137/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.27	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	331/ 555	3.73	4.17	4.29	4.14	4.36	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	3.45	3.63	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0205  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 182  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0206  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 183  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	8	6	4	3.48	1505/1649	3.41	4.16	4.28	4.11	3.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	5	4	3.43	1517/1648	3.40	3.98	4.23	4.16	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	7	7	3.76	1107/1375	3.41	3.97	4.27	4.10	3.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	2	3	6	3	3.00	1537/1595	3.31	3.99	4.20	4.03	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	5	6	3	3.10	1423/1533	3.47	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	6	5	4	3.20	1395/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	3	7	1	4	2.80	1571/1623	3.62	4.00	4.16	4.08	2.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	1148/1646	4.73	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	4	9	3	0	2.82	1551/1621	3.03	3.86	4.06	3.96	2.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	4	6	6	3.60	1440/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	2	7	3	6	3.45	1540/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64	3.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	6	6	3	3.20	1472/1564	3.56	4.06	4.28	4.20	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	6	4	2	5	2	2.63	1523/1559	3.13	4.06	4.29	4.20	2.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	4	3	4	2	3	2.81	1268/1352	3.37	4.02	3.98	3.86	2.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	3	1	5	1	2.71	1329/1384	3.09	3.91	4.08	3.86	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	5	3	0	4	2	2.64	1354/1382	3.21	4.01	4.29	4.03	2.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	5	3	2	1	2.62	1343/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	2.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	831/ 948	2.92	3.64	3.95	3.75	3.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	187/ 221	3.88	4.36	4.16	4.05	3.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	176/ 243	4.06	4.39	4.12	4.08	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	178/ 212	4.43	4.56	4.40	4.43	3.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	204/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	3.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	1	4	3	0	1	2.56	510/ 555	3.73	4.17	4.29	4.14	2.56	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	3.45	3.63	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	



Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0206  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 183  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100Y 0101  
 Title HONRS UNIV INTR:LIFE S  
 Instructor: BULGER, MICHELL  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 184  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.16	4.28	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	797/1648	4.33	3.98	4.23	4.16	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1375	****	3.97	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1219/1595	3.88	3.99	4.20	4.03	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1533	****	3.81	4.04	3.87	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1035/1512	3.89	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1491/1646	4.13	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	483/1621	4.43	3.86	4.06	3.96	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	699/1568	4.63	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1193/1572	4.56	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	524/1564	4.63	4.06	4.28	4.20	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1067/1559	4.11	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	860/1352	3.83	4.02	3.98	3.86	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	520/1384	4.43	3.91	4.08	3.86	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.01	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	560/1368	4.63	3.99	4.30	4.01	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	389/ 948	4.14	3.64	3.95	3.75	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.36	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.39	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.56	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.50	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	38/ 88	4.75	4.82	4.54	4.31	4.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	67/ 85	4.00	4.21	4.47	4.30	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	63/ 81	4.00	3.88	4.43	4.39	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	78/ 92	3.75	4.15	4.35	4.01	3.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.63	3.68	3.54	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100Y 0101  
 Title HONRS UNIV INTR:LIFE S  
 Instructor: BULGER, MICHELL  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 184  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 106 0101  
 Title THE HUMAN ORGANISM  
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN  
 Enrollment: 129  
 Questionnaires: 94

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 185  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	31	54	4.47	696/1649	4.47	4.16	4.28	4.11	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	10	20	61	4.47	614/1648	4.47	3.98	4.23	4.16	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	8	19	62	4.47	581/1375	4.47	3.97	4.27	4.10	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	49	3	2	5	8	27	4.20	890/1595	4.20	3.99	4.20	4.03	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	29	11	9	14	14	17	3.26	1362/1533	3.26	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	72	2	2	3	5	10	3.86	****/1512	****	3.83	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	18	68	4.60	405/1623	4.60	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	61	32	4.33	1348/1646	4.33	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	3	0	1	10	32	29	4.24	709/1621	4.24	3.86	4.06	3.96	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	11	80	4.85	330/1568	4.85	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	10	78	4.82	790/1572	4.82	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	6	18	66	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.06	4.28	4.20	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	14	73	4.76	390/1559	4.76	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	1	3	7	12	53	4.49	322/1352	4.49	4.02	3.98	3.86	4.49	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	8	4	9	11	26	3.74	970/1384	3.74	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.74	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	4	6	8	11	28	3.93	1014/1382	3.93	4.01	4.29	4.03	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	7	3	7	9	31	3.95	998/1368	3.95	3.99	4.30	4.01	3.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	36	43	3	2	0	4	6	3.53	****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	84	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	4.36	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	87	0	3	1	0	1	2	2.71	****/ 243	****	4.39	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	87	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.56	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	87	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.50	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	81	6	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	85	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	86	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	86	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	79	7	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	88	0	3	0	0	2	1	2.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	88	0	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	87	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	84	6	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	86	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	86	1	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	86	3	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	86	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	86	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	



Course-Section: BIOL 109 0101  
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO  
 Instructor: AKINMADE, DAMIL  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 186  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	8	3	3	3.64	1443/1649	3.05	4.16	4.28	4.11	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	3	7	1	3	3.29	1558/1648	2.99	3.98	4.23	4.16	3.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	3	6	3	0	2.71	1357/1375	2.38	3.97	4.27	4.10	2.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	6	5	3	3.79	1270/1595	3.30	3.99	4.20	4.03	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	3	4	2	3.00	1441/1533	3.04	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	3	3	3	2	3.00	1428/1512	2.90	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	5	3	4	1	3.08	1526/1623	3.09	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	531/1646	4.95	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	3	5	4	0	3.08	1491/1621	2.81	3.86	4.06	3.96	3.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	1031/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	1003/1572	4.34	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	4	5	2	3	3.29	1452/1564	3.13	4.06	4.28	4.20	3.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	7	2	3	3.36	1420/1559	3.17	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	650/1352	3.83	4.02	3.98	3.86	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1159/1384	3.33	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1086/1382	3.85	4.01	4.29	4.03	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1095/1368	3.69	3.99	4.30	4.01	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	3	0	1	4	3.44	727/ 948	3.12	3.64	3.95	3.75	3.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	119/ 221	4.19	4.36	4.16	4.05	4.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	103/ 243	4.46	4.39	4.12	4.08	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	90/ 212	4.64	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	164/ 209	4.38	4.50	4.35	4.38	3.91	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	351/ 555	4.34	4.17	4.29	4.14	4.27	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: BIOL 109 0102  
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO  
 Instructor: AKINMADE, DAMIL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 187  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	5	1	2	2	2.31	1645/1649	3.05	4.16	4.28	4.11	2.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	4	3	2	2	2.50	1633/1648	2.99	3.98	4.23	4.16	2.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	8	4	3	0	1	1.88	1373/1375	2.38	3.97	4.27	4.10	1.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	3	1	3	3	2.63	1579/1595	3.30	3.99	4.20	4.03	2.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	7	2	0	3	2.44	1515/1533	3.04	3.81	4.04	3.87	2.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	5	2	3	1	2.38	1499/1512	2.90	3.83	4.10	3.86	2.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	6	3	1	2	2.44	1603/1623	3.09	4.00	4.16	4.08	2.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	465/1646	4.95	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	4	3	0	4	1	2.58	1579/1621	2.81	3.86	4.06	3.96	2.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	1	2	3	5	3.43	1476/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	3.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	1510/1572	4.34	4.51	4.70	4.64	3.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	3	3	3	2	2.73	1535/1564	3.13	4.06	4.28	4.20	2.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	4	1	2	3	2.50	1528/1559	3.17	4.06	4.29	4.20	2.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	1	5	1	5	3.27	1156/1352	3.83	4.02	3.98	3.86	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	3	1	2	2	3.11	1244/1384	3.33	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1226/1382	3.85	4.01	4.29	4.03	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1085/1368	3.69	3.99	4.30	4.01	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	4	0	0	0	2	2.33	926/ 948	3.12	3.64	3.95	3.75	2.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	129/ 221	4.19	4.36	4.16	4.05	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	128/ 243	4.46	4.39	4.12	4.08	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	120/ 212	4.64	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.42	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	52/ 209	4.38	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	355/ 555	4.34	4.17	4.29	4.14	4.25	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 16
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 0
					Other 2

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 109 0103  
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO  
 Instructor: AKINMADE, DAMIL  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 188  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	3	3	0	2.73	1634/1649	3.05	4.16	4.28	4.11	2.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	5	4	1	1	2.82	1611/1648	2.99	3.98	4.23	4.16	2.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	4	2	1	0	2.00	1372/1375	2.38	3.97	4.27	4.10	2.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	5	1	2	3.18	1504/1595	3.30	3.99	4.20	4.03	3.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	3	1	3.18	1392/1533	3.04	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	3	2	1	2.82	1474/1512	2.90	3.83	4.10	3.86	2.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	1	6	0	3.09	1524/1623	3.09	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	4.95	4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	3	3	0	1	2.63	1575/1621	2.81	3.86	4.06	3.96	2.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1239/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1281/1572	4.34	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	2	2	3.20	1472/1564	3.13	4.06	4.28	4.20	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	3	2	2	3.20	1448/1559	3.17	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	818/1352	3.83	4.02	3.98	3.86	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1384	3.33	3.91	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	3.85	4.01	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	3.69	3.99	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	3.12	3.64	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	118/ 221	4.19	4.36	4.16	4.05	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	65/ 243	4.46	4.39	4.12	4.08	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	94/ 212	4.64	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	116/ 209	4.38	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	323/ 555	4.34	4.17	4.29	4.14	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	



Course-Section: BIOL 109 0103  
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO  
 Instructor: AKINMADE, DAMIL  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 188  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 109 0104  
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO  
 Instructor: AKINMADE, DAMIL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 189  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	4	4	3.50	1498/1649	3.05	4.16	4.28	4.11	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	2	4	3.38	1535/1648	2.99	3.98	4.23	4.16	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	5	3	2	2.94	1337/1375	2.38	3.97	4.27	4.10	2.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	1359/1595	3.30	3.99	4.20	4.03	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	1228/1533	3.04	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	5	4	3	3.40	1320/1512	2.90	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	1	7	3.75	1270/1623	3.09	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	465/1646	4.95	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	3	2	4	3	2	2.93	1528/1621	2.81	3.86	4.06	3.96	2.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1358/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	1339/1572	4.34	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	6	5	2	3.31	1445/1564	3.13	4.06	4.28	4.20	3.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1336/1559	3.17	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	655/1352	3.83	4.02	3.98	3.86	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	1	5	1	3.56	1060/1384	3.33	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	774/1382	3.85	4.01	4.29	4.03	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1162/1368	3.69	3.99	4.30	4.01	3.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	684/ 948	3.12	3.64	3.95	3.75	3.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	95/ 221	4.19	4.36	4.16	4.05	4.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	40/ 243	4.46	4.39	4.12	4.08	4.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	28/ 212	4.64	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.91	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	112/ 209	4.38	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	308/ 555	4.34	4.17	4.29	4.14	4.45	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 215H 0101  
 Title EBIOLOGY  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 190  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.16	4.28	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	475/1648	4.57	3.98	4.23	4.25	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	733/1375	4.33	3.97	4.27	4.37	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.99	4.20	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	703/1533	4.17	3.81	4.04	4.04	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	651/1512	4.29	3.83	4.10	4.14	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	994/1623	4.08	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	339/1621	4.49	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.49	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	715/1568	4.45	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.51	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	620/1564	4.27	4.06	4.28	4.27	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	376/1559	4.53	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	120/1352	4.85	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1384	4.17	3.91	4.08	3.99	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.01	4.29	4.19	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	654/1368	4.50	3.99	4.30	4.21	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	811/ 948	3.20	3.64	3.95	3.89	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	38/ 221	4.71	4.36	4.16	4.45	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	65/ 243	4.50	4.39	4.12	4.47	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	77/ 212	4.71	4.56	4.40	4.62	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	95/ 209	4.57	4.50	4.35	4.64	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	293/ 555	4.50	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	3.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.16	4.28	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	475/1648	4.57	3.98	4.23	4.25	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	733/1375	4.33	3.97	4.27	4.37	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.99	4.20	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	703/1533	4.17	3.81	4.04	4.04	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	651/1512	4.29	3.83	4.10	4.14	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	994/1623	4.08	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	483/1621	4.49	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.49	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	1096/1568	4.45	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.51	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1127/1564	4.27	4.06	4.28	4.27	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	945/1559	4.53	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	117/1352	4.85	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1384	4.17	3.91	4.08	3.99	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.01	4.29	4.19	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	654/1368	4.50	3.99	4.30	4.21	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	811/ 948	3.20	3.64	3.95	3.89	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	38/ 221	4.71	4.36	4.16	4.45	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	65/ 243	4.50	4.39	4.12	4.47	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	77/ 212	4.71	4.56	4.40	4.62	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	95/ 209	4.57	4.50	4.35	4.64	4.57	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	293/ 555	4.50	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	3.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 251 0101  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I  
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES  
 Enrollment: 188  
 Questionnaires: 150

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 192  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	11	0	1	4	11	26	97	4.54	603/1649	4.54	4.16	4.28	4.29	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	3	3	27	51	56	4.10	1065/1648	4.10	3.98	4.23	4.25	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	1	6	29	38	65	4.15	882/1375	4.15	3.97	4.27	4.37	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	82	2	3	11	12	28	4.09	1021/1595	4.09	3.99	4.20	4.22	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	13	2	5	26	35	57	4.12	733/1533	4.12	3.81	4.04	4.04	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	106	2	1	9	7	12	3.84	****/1512	****	3.83	4.10	4.14	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	1	4	8	21	35	70	4.15	926/1623	4.15	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	1	138	4.99	67/1646	4.99	4.82	4.69	4.63	4.99
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	33	2	5	2	19	48	41	4.03	903/1621	4.03	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	2	1	22	35	74	4.33	1060/1568	4.33	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	7	12	115	4.81	840/1572	4.81	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	1	6	21	44	61	4.19	1010/1564	4.19	4.06	4.28	4.27	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	22	22	88	4.45	777/1559	4.45	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	26	2	4	22	29	46	4.10	638/1352	4.10	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	124	0	3	3	3	7	10	3.69	****/1384	****	3.91	4.08	3.99	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	125	0	2	1	6	7	9	3.80	****/1382	****	4.01	4.29	4.19	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	125	0	2	0	8	3	12	3.92	****/1368	****	3.99	4.30	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	124	16	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	143	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/ 221	****	4.36	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	143	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/ 243	****	4.39	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	143	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/ 212	****	4.56	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	143	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/ 209	****	4.50	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	130	2	0	0	4	1	13	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	149	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	149	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	149	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	149	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	146	0	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	149	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	149	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	149	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	149	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	144	1	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	148	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	148	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	148	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	148	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	146	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****

Course-Section: BIOL 251 0101  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I  
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES  
 Enrollment: 188  
 Questionnaires: 150

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 192  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 25	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 16
28-55	15	1.00-1.99 1	B 58		
56-83	17	2.00-2.99 17	C 16	General 12	Under-grad 150 Non-major 134
84-150	23	3.00-3.49 19	D 3		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 25	F 1	Electives 14	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 86	
			? 7		

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0101  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB  
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 193  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	510/1649	4.71	4.16	4.28	4.29	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	3	9	3.85	1271/1648	4.29	3.98	4.23	4.25	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	9	3.90	1034/1375	4.23	3.97	4.27	4.37	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	4	2	6	3.86	1231/1595	4.21	3.99	4.20	4.22	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	710/1533	4.38	3.81	4.04	4.04	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.83	4.10	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	803/1623	4.27	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	865/1646	4.91	4.82	4.69	4.63	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	3	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	914/1621	4.13	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	1080/1568	4.37	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	1365/1572	4.54	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	822/1564	4.34	4.06	4.28	4.27	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	0	8	4.18	1016/1559	4.50	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1090/1352	4.15	4.02	3.98	4.07	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1039/1384	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.99	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1069/1382	3.96	4.01	4.29	4.19	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	948/1368	4.14	3.99	4.30	4.21	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 948	4.25	3.64	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	55/ 221	4.72	4.36	4.16	4.45	4.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	98/ 243	4.64	4.39	4.12	4.47	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	129/ 212	4.57	4.56	4.40	4.62	4.31	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	87/ 209	4.73	4.50	4.35	4.64	4.62	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	11	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 555	4.78	4.17	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0101  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB  
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 193  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	16
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						



Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0101  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 194  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	510/1649	4.71	4.16	4.28	4.29	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	3	9	3.85	1271/1648	4.29	3.98	4.23	4.25	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	9	3.90	1034/1375	4.23	3.97	4.27	4.37	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	4	2	6	3.86	1231/1595	4.21	3.99	4.20	4.22	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	710/1533	4.38	3.81	4.04	4.04	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.83	4.10	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	803/1623	4.27	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	865/1646	4.91	4.82	4.69	4.63	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	7	5	3.94	1001/1621	4.13	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	1088/1568	4.37	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	1400/1572	4.54	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	1064/1564	4.34	4.06	4.28	4.27	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	5	9	4.25	966/1559	4.50	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	690/1352	4.15	4.02	3.98	4.07	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1039/1384	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.99	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1069/1382	3.96	4.01	4.29	4.19	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	948/1368	4.14	3.99	4.30	4.21	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 948	4.25	3.64	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	55/ 221	4.72	4.36	4.16	4.45	4.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	98/ 243	4.64	4.39	4.12	4.47	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	129/ 212	4.57	4.56	4.40	4.62	4.31	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	87/ 209	4.73	4.50	4.35	4.64	4.62	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	11	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 555	4.78	4.17	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0101  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 194  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	16
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0101  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 195  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	510/1649	4.71	4.16	4.28	4.29	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	3	9	3.85	1271/1648	4.29	3.98	4.23	4.25	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	9	3.90	1034/1375	4.23	3.97	4.27	4.37	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	4	2	6	3.86	1231/1595	4.21	3.99	4.20	4.22	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	710/1533	4.38	3.81	4.04	4.04	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.83	4.10	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	803/1623	4.27	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	865/1646	4.91	4.82	4.69	4.63	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	7	4	3.88	1078/1621	4.13	3.86	4.06	4.01	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	1112/1568	4.37	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	1365/1572	4.54	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	1055/1564	4.34	4.06	4.28	4.27	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	5	8	4.20	1009/1559	4.50	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	10	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	556/1352	4.15	4.02	3.98	4.07	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	1039/1384	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.99	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1069/1382	3.96	4.01	4.29	4.19	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	948/1368	4.14	3.99	4.30	4.21	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 948	4.25	3.64	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	55/ 221	4.72	4.36	4.16	4.45	4.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	98/ 243	4.64	4.39	4.12	4.47	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	129/ 212	4.57	4.56	4.40	4.62	4.31	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	87/ 209	4.73	4.50	4.35	4.64	4.62	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	11	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 555	4.78	4.17	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0101  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 195  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	16
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	433/1649	4.71	4.16	4.28	4.29	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	672/1648	4.29	3.98	4.23	4.25	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	733/1375	4.23	3.97	4.27	4.37	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	497/1595	4.21	3.99	4.20	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	327/1533	4.38	3.81	4.04	4.04	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.83	4.10	4.14	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	541/1623	4.27	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.91	4.82	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	535/1621	4.13	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	815/1568	4.37	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	1003/1572	4.54	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	908/1564	4.34	4.06	4.28	4.27	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	0	2	10	4.29	945/1559	4.50	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	172/1352	4.15	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1384	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.99	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1382	3.96	4.01	4.29	4.19	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1368	4.14	3.99	4.30	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	4.25	3.64	3.95	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	40/ 221	4.72	4.36	4.16	4.45	4.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	44/ 243	4.64	4.39	4.12	4.47	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	62/ 212	4.57	4.56	4.40	4.62	4.76
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	42/ 209	4.73	4.50	4.35	4.64	4.82
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	12	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 555	4.78	4.17	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16



Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0102  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 197  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	433/1649	4.71	4.16	4.28	4.29	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	672/1648	4.29	3.98	4.23	4.25	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	733/1375	4.23	3.97	4.27	4.37	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	497/1595	4.21	3.99	4.20	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	327/1533	4.38	3.81	4.04	4.04	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.83	4.10	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	541/1623	4.27	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.91	4.82	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	870/1621	4.13	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	969/1568	4.37	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	765/1572	4.54	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	651/1564	4.34	4.06	4.28	4.27	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	205/1559	4.50	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	582/1352	4.15	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1384	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1382	3.96	4.01	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1368	4.14	3.99	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	4.25	3.64	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	40/ 221	4.72	4.36	4.16	4.45	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	44/ 243	4.64	4.39	4.12	4.47	4.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	62/ 212	4.57	4.56	4.40	4.62	4.76	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	42/ 209	4.73	4.50	4.35	4.64	4.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	12	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 555	4.78	4.17	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	Non-major
			Other	16	

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant





Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0102  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 198  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	433/1649	4.71	4.16	4.28	4.29	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	672/1648	4.29	3.98	4.23	4.25	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	733/1375	4.23	3.97	4.27	4.37	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	497/1595	4.21	3.99	4.20	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	327/1533	4.38	3.81	4.04	4.04	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.83	4.10	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	541/1623	4.27	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.91	4.82	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	754/1621	4.13	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	731/1568	4.37	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	591/1572	4.54	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	263/1564	4.34	4.06	4.28	4.27	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	4.50	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1352	4.15	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1384	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1382	3.96	4.01	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1368	4.14	3.99	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	4.25	3.64	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	40/ 221	4.72	4.36	4.16	4.45	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	44/ 243	4.64	4.39	4.12	4.47	4.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	62/ 212	4.57	4.56	4.40	4.62	4.76	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	42/ 209	4.73	4.50	4.35	4.64	4.82	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	12	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 555	4.78	4.17	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16



Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0103  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB  
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 199  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	203/1649	4.71	4.16	4.28	4.29	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	770/1648	4.29	3.98	4.23	4.25	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	771/1375	4.23	3.97	4.27	4.37	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	3	3	6	3.73	1295/1595	4.21	3.99	4.20	4.22	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	476/1533	4.38	3.81	4.04	4.04	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	1	3	0	4	3.30	1356/1512	4.00	3.83	4.10	4.14	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	2	9	4.13	957/1623	4.27	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	15	4.81	816/1646	4.91	4.82	4.69	4.63	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	571/1621	4.13	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	1012/1568	4.37	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	665/1572	4.54	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	702/1564	4.34	4.06	4.28	4.27	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	790/1559	4.50	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	432/1352	4.15	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	613/1384	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.99	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	676/1382	3.96	4.01	4.29	4.19	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	616/1368	4.14	3.99	4.30	4.21	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	342/ 948	4.25	3.64	3.95	3.89	4.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	26/ 221	4.72	4.36	4.16	4.45	4.79	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	25/ 243	4.64	4.39	4.12	4.47	4.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	97/ 212	4.57	4.56	4.40	4.62	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	58/ 209	4.73	4.50	4.35	4.64	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	5	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	246/ 555	4.78	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.78	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	3.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0103  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB  
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 199  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0104  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB  
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 200  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	230/1649	4.71	4.16	4.28	4.29	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	300/1648	4.29	3.98	4.23	4.25	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	15	4.52	529/1375	4.23	3.97	4.27	4.37	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	440/1595	4.21	3.99	4.20	4.22	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	432/1533	4.38	3.81	4.04	4.04	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	595/1512	4.00	3.83	4.10	4.14	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	6	10	4.05	1009/1623	4.27	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.91	4.82	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	198/1621	4.13	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	573/1568	4.37	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	355/1572	4.54	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	498/1564	4.34	4.06	4.28	4.27	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	463/1559	4.50	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	9	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1352	4.15	4.02	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1384	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1382	3.96	4.01	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1368	4.14	3.99	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	4.25	3.64	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	18/ 221	4.72	4.36	4.16	4.45	4.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	25/ 243	4.64	4.39	4.12	4.47	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	86/ 212	4.57	4.56	4.40	4.62	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	52/ 209	4.73	4.50	4.35	4.64	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 555	4.78	4.17	4.29	4.33	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 17		
				? 0			

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0104  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 201  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	230/1649	4.71	4.16	4.28	4.29	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	300/1648	4.29	3.98	4.23	4.25	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	15	4.52	529/1375	4.23	3.97	4.27	4.37	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	440/1595	4.21	3.99	4.20	4.22	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	432/1533	4.38	3.81	4.04	4.04	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	595/1512	4.00	3.83	4.10	4.14	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	6	10	4.05	1009/1623	4.27	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.91	4.82	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	4	7	0	3.64	1281/1621	4.13	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1366/1568	4.37	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1521/1572	4.54	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1316/1564	4.34	4.06	4.28	4.27	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1559	4.50	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	4.15	4.02	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1384	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1382	3.96	4.01	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1368	4.14	3.99	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	4.25	3.64	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	18/ 221	4.72	4.36	4.16	4.45	4.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	25/ 243	4.64	4.39	4.12	4.47	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	86/ 212	4.57	4.56	4.40	4.62	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	52/ 209	4.73	4.50	4.35	4.64	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 555	4.78	4.17	4.29	4.33	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 10	Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 16
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 17

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	19	34	44	4.16	1067/1649	4.16	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	24	34	39	4.07	1088/1648	4.07	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	5	23	40	29	3.84	1065/1375	3.84	3.97	4.27	4.22	3.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	38	4	3	13	18	25	3.90	1202/1595	3.90	3.99	4.20	4.21	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	18	8	20	23	26	3.33	1341/1533	3.33	3.81	4.04	4.05	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	48	1	8	12	18	13	3.65	1175/1512	3.65	3.83	4.10	4.11	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	6	16	22	53	4.22	849/1623	4.22	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	40	58	4.57	1139/1646	4.57	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	1	2	0	20	39	8	3.74	1209/1621	3.74	3.86	4.06	4.02	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	5	6	21	62	4.45	917/1568	4.45	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	2	3	12	75	4.70	1034/1572	4.70	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	2	3	11	36	40	4.18	1010/1564	4.18	4.06	4.28	4.25	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	3	8	28	51	4.30	931/1559	4.30	4.06	4.29	4.23	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	2	0	12	22	50	4.37	423/1352	4.37	4.02	3.98	3.97	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	48	0	4	2	5	25	17	3.92	867/1384	3.92	3.91	4.08	4.11	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	48	0	1	4	7	17	24	4.11	917/1382	4.11	4.01	4.29	4.37	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	47	0	2	0	4	11	37	4.50	654/1368	4.50	3.99	4.30	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	47	8	5	4	12	15	10	3.46	722/ 948	3.46	3.64	3.95	4.00	3.46	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	99	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 243	****	4.39	4.12	3.89	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	96	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	99	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	99	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	97	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	100	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	100	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	100	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	100	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	99	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	35	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	55
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	1	B	36						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	6	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	100	Non-major	46
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	70				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302 0101  
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI  
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN  
 Enrollment: 300  
 Questionnaires: 154

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 203  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	7	4	23	37	80	4.19	1037/1649	4.33	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	8	7	25	56	54	3.94	1187/1648	4.02	3.98	4.23	4.18	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	8	21	38	39	44	3.60	1169/1375	3.95	3.97	4.27	4.22	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	94	8	6	12	15	16	3.44	1430/1595	3.72	3.99	4.20	4.21	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	29	38	13	31	21	19	2.75	1493/1533	3.07	3.81	4.04	4.05	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	112	4	5	13	6	10	3.34	****/1512	3.67	3.83	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	5	6	25	48	66	4.09	984/1623	4.36	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	2	0	0	3	145	4.93	531/1646	4.95	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	0	2	1	30	65	33	3.96	972/1621	4.14	3.86	4.06	4.02	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	3	1	5	30	110	4.63	683/1568	4.69	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	3	1	2	22	121	4.72	985/1572	4.79	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	2	22	50	71	4.22	971/1564	4.34	4.06	4.28	4.25	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	2	4	7	12	35	88	4.34	891/1559	4.47	4.06	4.29	4.23	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	6	7	14	49	67	4.15	599/1352	4.33	4.02	3.98	3.97	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	48	11	19	24	22	2.69	1333/1384	3.04	3.91	4.08	4.11	2.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	28	15	25	23	33	3.15	1302/1382	3.41	4.01	4.29	4.37	3.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	24	8	29	30	28	3.25	1252/1368	3.37	3.99	4.30	4.39	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	33	97	6	3	3	5	7	3.17	****/ 948	4.44	3.64	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	142	0	1	1	4	0	6	3.75	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	141	2	2	2	0	7	0	3.09	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	136	1	0	6	1	10	0	3.24	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	153	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	153	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 42	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 73
28-55	36	1.00-1.99 0	B 56		
56-83	21	2.00-2.99 9	C 23	General 0	Under-grad 154 Non-major 81
84-150	16	3.00-3.49 31	D 3		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 46	F 1	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 126	
			? 3		





Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0101  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 205  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	830/1649	4.29	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	825/1648	4.15	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	380/1375	4.45	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.68		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	608/1595	4.33	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	0	7	9	4.22	653/1533	3.73	3.81	4.04	4.05	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	9	9	4.37	564/1512	4.19	3.83	4.10	4.11	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	4	11	4.26	803/1623	3.95	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	680/1646	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	483/1621	4.09	3.86	4.06	4.02	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	827/1568	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	1046/1572	4.35	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	5	10	4.16	1037/1564	3.97	4.06	4.28	4.25	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	871/1559	4.03	4.06	4.29	4.23	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	1	1	7	7	4.06	661/1352	3.84	4.02	3.98	3.97	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	165/1384	4.61	3.91	4.08	4.11	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1382	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1368	4.67	3.99	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	137/ 948	4.38	3.64	3.95	4.00	4.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	82/ 221	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	149/ 243	4.30	4.39	4.12	3.89	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	65/ 212	4.62	4.56	4.40	4.21	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	52/ 209	4.65	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	2	2	5	8	3.94	412/ 555	4.28	4.17	4.29	4.22	3.94	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0101  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 205  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0101  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 206  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	830/1649	4.29	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	825/1648	4.15	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	14	14	4.68	380/1375	4.45	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	3	12	4.42	608/1595	4.33	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	0	7	9	4.22	653/1533	3.73	3.81	4.04	4.05	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	9	9	4.37	564/1512	4.19	3.83	4.10	4.11	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	2	4	11	4.26	803/1623	3.95	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	680/1646	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	789/1621	4.09	3.86	4.06	4.02	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	1002/1568	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1212/1572	4.35	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	610/1564	3.97	4.06	4.28	4.25	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	651/1559	4.03	4.06	4.29	4.23	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	836/1352	3.84	4.02	3.98	3.97	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	165/1384	4.61	3.91	4.08	4.11	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1382	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1368	4.67	3.99	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	137/ 948	4.38	3.64	3.95	4.00	4.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	82/ 221	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	149/ 243	4.30	4.39	4.12	3.89	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	65/ 212	4.62	4.56	4.40	4.21	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	52/ 209	4.65	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	2	2	5	8	3.94	412/ 555	4.28	4.17	4.29	4.22	3.94	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0101  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 206  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0102  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 207  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	1047/1649	4.29	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	6	5	5	3.82	1296/1648	4.15	3.98	4.23	4.18	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	771/1375	4.45	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	770/1595	4.33	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	2	4	7	2	3.44	1296/1533	3.73	3.81	4.04	4.05	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	10	6	4.24	711/1512	4.19	3.83	4.10	4.11	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	2	7	4	3.59	1355/1623	3.95	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	993/1646	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	305/1621	4.09	3.86	4.06	4.02	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	0	6	9	4.29	1088/1568	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	912/1572	4.35	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	1127/1564	3.97	4.06	4.28	4.25	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	1060/1559	4.03	4.06	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	286/1352	3.84	4.02	3.98	3.97	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1384	4.61	3.91	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1382	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1368	4.67	3.99	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 948	4.38	3.64	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	64/ 221	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	45/ 243	4.30	4.39	4.12	3.89	4.69	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	82/ 212	4.62	4.56	4.40	4.21	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	39/ 209	4.65	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.85	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	382/ 555	4.28	4.17	4.29	4.22	4.08	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 0			

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0102  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 208  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	1047/1649	4.29	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	6	5	5	3.82	1296/1648	4.15	3.98	4.23	4.18	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	771/1375	4.45	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	770/1595	4.33	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	2	4	7	2	3.44	1296/1533	3.73	3.81	4.04	4.05	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	10	6	4.24	711/1512	4.19	3.83	4.10	4.11	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	2	7	4	3.59	1355/1623	3.95	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	993/1646	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	632/1621	4.09	3.86	4.06	4.02	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1227/1568	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	1289/1572	4.35	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1073/1564	3.97	4.06	4.28	4.25	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1211/1559	4.03	4.06	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	942/1352	3.84	4.02	3.98	3.97	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1384	4.61	3.91	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1382	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1368	4.67	3.99	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 948	4.38	3.64	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	64/ 221	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	45/ 243	4.30	4.39	4.12	3.89	4.69	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	82/ 212	4.62	4.56	4.40	4.21	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	39/ 209	4.65	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.85	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	382/ 555	4.28	4.17	4.29	4.22	4.08	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0103  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 209  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	484/1649	4.29	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	556/1648	4.15	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	546/1375	4.45	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	746/1595	4.33	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	774/1533	3.73	3.81	4.04	4.05	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	595/1512	4.19	3.83	4.10	4.11	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	671/1623	3.95	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	1166/1646	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	252/1621	4.09	3.86	4.06	4.02	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	852/1568	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	1003/1572	4.35	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	0	0	4	8	4.14	1046/1564	3.97	4.06	4.28	4.25	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	749/1559	4.03	4.06	4.29	4.23	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	690/1352	3.84	4.02	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	655/1384	4.61	3.91	4.08	4.11	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	946/1382	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.37	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	948/1368	4.67	3.99	4.30	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	619/ 948	4.38	3.64	3.95	4.00	3.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 221	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 243	4.30	4.39	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 212	4.62	4.56	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 209	4.65	4.50	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 555	4.28	4.17	4.29	4.22	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 15		
				? 0			



Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0104  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 210  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	3	10	4.10	1116/1649	4.29	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	7	8	4.00	1124/1648	4.15	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	763/1375	4.45	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	5	8	4.00	1067/1595	4.33	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	4	3	6	3.44	1289/1533	3.73	3.81	4.04	4.05	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	4	9	4.10	835/1512	4.19	3.83	4.10	4.11	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1029/1623	3.95	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	664/1646	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	4	5	4	3.60	1302/1621	4.09	3.86	4.06	4.02	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	1080/1568	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	1193/1572	4.35	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	1	8	7	3.89	1224/1564	3.97	4.06	4.28	4.25	3.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	7	8	4.00	1121/1559	4.03	4.06	4.29	4.23	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	991/1352	3.84	4.02	3.98	3.97	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.61	3.91	4.08	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1382	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1368	4.67	3.99	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 948	4.38	3.64	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	82/ 221	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	85/ 243	4.30	4.39	4.12	3.89	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	105/ 212	4.62	4.56	4.40	4.21	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	66/ 209	4.65	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.69	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	290/ 555	4.28	4.17	4.29	4.22	4.53	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0104  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 210  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0104  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 211  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	3	10	4.10	1116/1649	4.29	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	7	8	4.00	1124/1648	4.15	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	11	4.30	763/1375	4.45	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	5	8	4.00	1067/1595	4.33	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	4	3	6	3.44	1289/1533	3.73	3.81	4.04	4.05	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	4	9	4.10	835/1512	4.19	3.83	4.10	4.11	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1029/1623	3.95	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	664/1646	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1485/1621	4.09	3.86	4.06	4.02	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1369/1568	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	1463/1572	4.35	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1365/1564	3.97	4.06	4.28	4.25	3.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1295/1559	4.03	4.06	4.29	4.23	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	8	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1352	3.84	4.02	3.98	3.97	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.61	3.91	4.08	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1382	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1368	4.67	3.99	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 948	4.38	3.64	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	82/ 221	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	85/ 243	4.30	4.39	4.12	3.89	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	105/ 212	4.62	4.56	4.40	4.21	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	66/ 209	4.65	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.69	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	290/ 555	4.28	4.17	4.29	4.22	4.53	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0104  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 211  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0105  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 212  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	871/1649	4.29	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	797/1648	4.15	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	641/1375	4.45	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	12	4.33	722/1595	4.33	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	774/1533	3.73	3.81	4.04	4.05	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	7	8	4.15	791/1512	4.19	3.83	4.10	4.11	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	5	8	3.80	1241/1623	3.95	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	332/1646	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	595/1621	4.09	3.86	4.06	4.02	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	1002/1568	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	1071/1572	4.35	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	7	9	4.05	1109/1564	3.97	4.06	4.28	4.25	4.02	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	7	11	4.24	980/1559	4.03	4.06	4.29	4.23	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	5	8	4	3.68	960/1352	3.84	4.02	3.98	3.97	3.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1384	4.61	3.91	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1382	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1368	4.67	3.99	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 948	4.38	3.64	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	99/ 221	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	155/ 243	4.30	4.39	4.12	3.89	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	105/ 212	4.62	4.56	4.40	4.21	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	87/ 209	4.65	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.61	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	280/ 555	4.28	4.17	4.29	4.22	4.61	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0105  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 213  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	871/1649	4.29	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	797/1648	4.15	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	641/1375	4.45	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	12	4.33	722/1595	4.33	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	774/1533	3.73	3.81	4.04	4.05	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	7	8	4.15	791/1512	4.19	3.83	4.10	4.11	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	5	8	3.80	1241/1623	3.95	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	332/1646	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1123/1621	4.09	3.86	4.06	4.02	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	5	0	4	3.70	1418/1568	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1492/1572	4.35	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1127/1564	3.97	4.06	4.28	4.25	4.02	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	4	1	3	3.40	1408/1559	4.03	4.06	4.29	4.23	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1049/1352	3.84	4.02	3.98	3.97	3.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1384	4.61	3.91	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1382	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1368	4.67	3.99	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 948	4.38	3.64	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	99/ 221	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	155/ 243	4.30	4.39	4.12	3.89	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	105/ 212	4.62	4.56	4.40	4.21	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	87/ 209	4.65	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.61	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	280/ 555	4.28	4.17	4.29	4.22	4.61	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 10
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 3	Electives 0
					Other 17

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0106  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 214  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	912/1649	4.29	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1065/1648	4.15	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	546/1375	4.45	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	383/1595	4.33	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1338/1533	3.73	3.81	4.04	4.05	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	883/1512	4.19	3.83	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1180/1623	3.95	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	1004/1646	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	511/1621	4.09	3.86	4.06	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	1080/1568	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.39	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1146/1572	4.35	4.51	4.70	4.64	3.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1273/1564	3.97	4.06	4.28	4.25	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1197/1559	4.03	4.06	4.29	4.23	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1025/1352	3.84	4.02	3.98	3.97	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	613/1384	4.61	3.91	4.08	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	946/1382	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.37	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1368	4.67	3.99	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	4.38	3.64	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	127/ 221	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	135/ 243	4.30	4.39	4.12	3.89	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	86/ 212	4.62	4.56	4.40	4.21	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	121/ 209	4.65	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	361/ 555	4.28	4.17	4.29	4.22	4.22	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0106  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 215  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	912/1649	4.29	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1065/1648	4.15	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	546/1375	4.45	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	383/1595	4.33	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1338/1533	3.73	3.81	4.04	4.05	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	883/1512	4.19	3.83	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1180/1623	3.95	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	1004/1646	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1302/1621	4.09	3.86	4.06	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1488/1568	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.39	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1556/1572	4.35	4.51	4.70	4.64	3.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1441/1564	3.97	4.06	4.28	4.25	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1322/1559	4.03	4.06	4.29	4.23	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	3.84	4.02	3.98	3.97	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	613/1384	4.61	3.91	4.08	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	946/1382	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.37	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1368	4.67	3.99	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	4.38	3.64	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	127/ 221	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	135/ 243	4.30	4.39	4.12	3.89	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	86/ 212	4.62	4.56	4.40	4.21	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	121/ 209	4.65	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	361/ 555	4.28	4.17	4.29	4.22	4.22	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101  
 Title CELL BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 153  
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 216  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	3	15	18	21	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	3	5	17	22	10	3.54	1467/1648	3.54	3.98	4.23	4.18	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	6	7	14	20	9	3.34	1259/1375	3.34	3.97	4.27	4.22	3.34	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	39	2	4	5	3	4	3.17	1510/1595	3.17	3.99	4.20	4.21	3.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	1	9	12	14	10	11	3.04	1435/1533	3.04	3.81	4.04	4.05	3.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	45	2	2	4	1	2	2.91	****/1512	****	3.83	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	1	3	7	12	7	27	3.86	1210/1623	3.86	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	1	56	4.98	133/1646	4.98	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	2	27	14	4	3.38	1415/1621	3.61	3.86	4.06	4.02	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	2	6	15	34	4.42	956/1568	4.52	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	1	6	11	38	4.47	1265/1572	4.58	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	3	21	20	11	3.61	1356/1564	3.87	4.06	4.28	4.25	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	7	5	9	17	19	3.63	1333/1559	3.93	4.06	4.29	4.23	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	3	5	10	15	18	3.78	893/1352	3.97	4.02	3.98	3.97	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	52	0	8	1	0	2	1	1.92	****/1384	****	3.91	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	52	0	7	1	0	0	4	2.42	****/1382	****	4.01	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	53	0	4	1	2	2	2	2.73	****/1368	****	3.99	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	53	8	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	63	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.39	4.12	3.89	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 35
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	11	2.00-2.99 7	C 15	General 1	Under-grad 64 Non-major 29
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 9	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 43	
			? 7		

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101  
 Title CELL BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 153  
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 217  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	3	15	18	21	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	3	5	17	22	10	3.54	1467/1648	3.54	3.98	4.23	4.18	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	6	7	14	20	9	3.34	1259/1375	3.34	3.97	4.27	4.22	3.34	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	39	2	4	5	3	4	3.17	1510/1595	3.17	3.99	4.20	4.21	3.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	1	9	12	14	10	11	3.04	1435/1533	3.04	3.81	4.04	4.05	3.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	45	2	2	4	1	2	2.91	****/1512	****	3.83	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	1	3	7	12	7	27	3.86	1210/1623	3.86	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	1	56	4.98	133/1646	4.98	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	1	1	14	20	12	3.85	1105/1621	3.61	3.86	4.06	4.02	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	4	10	40	4.62	715/1568	4.52	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	0	0	13	41	4.69	1034/1572	4.58	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	4	9	18	24	4.13	1064/1564	3.87	4.06	4.28	4.25	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	5	5	13	31	4.24	980/1559	3.93	4.06	4.29	4.23	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	3	3	6	13	29	4.15	599/1352	3.97	4.02	3.98	3.97	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	52	0	8	1	0	2	1	1.92	****/1384	****	3.91	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	52	0	7	1	0	0	4	2.42	****/1382	****	4.01	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	53	0	4	1	2	2	2	2.73	****/1368	****	3.99	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	53	8	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	63	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.39	4.12	3.89	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 35
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	11	2.00-2.99 7	C 15	General 1	Under-grad 64 Non-major 29
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 9	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 43	
			? 7		

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 0101  
 Title CELL BIOLOGY LAB  
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN  
 Enrollment: 198  
 Questionnaires: 171

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 218  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	17	0	2	5	12	54	81	4.34	857/1649	4.34	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	20	0	3	5	10	39	94	4.43	658/1648	4.43	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	22	1	3	5	16	43	81	4.31	753/1375	4.31	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	24	3	3	6	14	50	71	4.25	818/1595	4.25	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	34	18	4	8	18	34	55	4.08	768/1533	4.08	3.81	4.04	4.05	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	33	2	4	9	23	42	58	4.04	868/1512	4.04	3.83	4.10	4.11	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	29	1	2	8	15	39	77	4.28	780/1623	4.28	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	33	2	1	2	0	12	121	4.84	782/1646	4.84	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	6	1	6	63	83	4.36	571/1621	4.36	3.86	4.06	4.02	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	47	0	0	0	7	16	101	4.76	480/1568	4.76	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	47	0	0	1	5	20	98	4.73	967/1572	4.73	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	49	0	0	0	9	20	93	4.69	447/1564	4.69	4.06	4.28	4.25	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	49	0	0	3	5	24	90	4.65	536/1559	4.65	4.06	4.29	4.23	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	56	25	6	3	16	29	36	3.96	754/1352	3.96	4.02	3.98	3.97	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	145	0	0	0	7	4	15	4.31	****/1384	****	3.91	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	146	0	0	1	5	2	17	4.40	****/1382	****	4.01	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	146	0	0	2	3	3	17	4.40	****/1368	****	3.99	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	147	8	1	2	3	2	8	3.88	****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	99	0	0	1	7	23	41	4.44	79/ 221	4.44	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.44
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	100	0	0	1	2	13	55	4.72	42/ 243	4.72	4.39	4.12	3.89	4.72
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	100	1	0	1	6	17	46	4.54	100/ 212	4.54	4.56	4.40	4.21	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	100	1	1	2	2	19	46	4.53	105/ 209	4.53	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.53
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	92	0	2	3	11	20	43	4.25	355/ 555	4.25	4.17	4.29	4.22	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	167	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	167	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	167	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	167	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	156	0	0	3	1	9	2	3.67	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	168	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	168	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	168	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	168	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	154	0	0	6	0	10	1	3.35	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	168	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	168	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	168	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	168	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	165	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 0101  
 Title CELL BIOLOGY LAB  
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN  
 Enrollment: 198  
 Questionnaires: 171

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 218  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	53	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	109
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	42						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	12	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	170	Non-major	62
84-150	44	3.00-3.49	26	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	101				
				?	4						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	3	2	16	31	39	4.11	1116/1649	4.11	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	2	24	30	34	4.03	1106/1648	4.03	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	11	11	36	34	4.01	946/1375	4.01	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.01	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	51	2	4	8	13	12	3.74	1290/1595	3.74	3.99	4.20	4.21	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	17	21	6	17	16	13	2.92	1472/1533	2.92	3.81	4.04	4.05	2.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	65	1	2	10	5	7	3.60	1202/1512	3.60	3.83	4.10	4.11	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	3	11	13	23	39	3.94	1119/1623	3.94	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	2	0	1	85	4.92	531/1646	4.92	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	2	27	42	10	3.71	1234/1621	3.71	3.86	4.06	4.02	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	10	32	45	4.40	983/1568	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	25	59	4.64	1096/1572	4.64	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	3	20	31	31	4.06	1105/1564	4.06	4.06	4.28	4.25	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	3	10	28	45	4.34	901/1559	4.34	4.06	4.29	4.23	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	1	3	12	28	39	4.22	541/1352	4.22	4.02	3.98	3.97	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	90	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1384	****	3.91	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	88	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1382	****	4.01	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	89	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1368	****	3.99	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	89	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	93	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	4.36	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	93	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 243	****	4.39	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	93	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 212	****	4.56	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	93	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 209	****	4.50	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	87	0	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	89	1	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	93	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	93	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	86	1	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	93	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	91	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 33		Graduate 2
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	C 15	General	1
84-150	24	3.00-3.49	D 0		92
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	62



Course-Section: BIOL 396 0101  
 Title UGRAD TCHNG ASSISTANTS  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 220  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.16	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1648	5.00	3.98	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	3.97	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1595	4.67	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1533	5.00	3.81	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1512	5.00	3.83	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.00	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1621	5.00	3.86	4.06	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.32	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.51	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.06	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.06	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.02	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	3.91	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.01	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	3.99	4.30	4.39	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

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





Course-Section: BIOL 414B 0101  
 Title EUKARYOTICS GENETICS  
 Instructor: EISENMANN, DAVI  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 222  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	464/1648	4.58	3.98	4.23	4.36	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	546/1375	4.50	3.97	4.27	4.48	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	321/1595	4.67	3.99	4.20	4.36	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	180/1533	4.75	3.81	4.04	4.14	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	627/1512	4.30	3.83	4.10	4.26	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	568/1623	4.45	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	595/1621	4.33	3.86	4.06	4.24	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.32	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.51	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1564	4.90	4.06	4.28	4.40	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	318/1559	4.80	4.06	4.29	4.41	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.91	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/1382	4.90	4.01	4.29	4.56	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	264/1368	4.90	3.99	4.30	4.58	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	3.64	3.95	4.31	4.67	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	5	6	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	7	3	0	2.59	1630/1648	2.59	3.98	4.23	4.36	2.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	6	1	3.29	1269/1375	3.29	3.97	4.27	4.48	3.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	1566/1595	2.80	3.99	4.20	4.36	2.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	781/1533	4.06	3.81	4.04	4.14	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	3	2	3	2	0	2.40	1498/1512	2.40	3.83	4.10	4.26	2.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	5	3	3	3.13	1517/1623	3.13	4.00	4.16	4.27	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1391/1646	4.27	4.82	4.69	4.71	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	6	6	1	3.33	1429/1621	3.33	3.86	4.06	4.24	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1358/1568	3.88	4.32	4.43	4.54	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	1165/1572	4.59	4.51	4.70	4.79	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	10	3	0	2.94	1512/1564	2.94	4.06	4.28	4.40	2.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	7	4	3.69	1315/1559	3.69	4.06	4.29	4.41	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1352	****	4.02	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	613/1384	4.33	3.91	4.08	4.35	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	262/1382	4.89	4.01	4.29	4.56	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	403/1368	4.78	3.99	4.30	4.58	4.78	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.86	3.68	3.95	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	9	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 430 0101  
 Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: GLUICK, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 224  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	4	10	7	3.87	1303/1649	3.87	4.16	4.28	4.50	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	9	8	3.87	1262/1648	3.87	3.98	4.23	4.36	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	5	8	7	3.86	1055/1375	3.86	3.97	4.27	4.48	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	6	7	5	3.62	1365/1595	3.62	3.99	4.20	4.36	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	4	10	6	3.82	1006/1533	3.82	3.81	4.04	4.14	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	1	1	6	6	3.65	1180/1512	3.65	3.83	4.10	4.26	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	2	2	7	9	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	731/1646	4.86	4.82	4.69	4.71	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	914/1621	4.00	3.86	4.06	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	8	12	4.36	1021/1568	4.36	4.32	4.43	4.54	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	1	19	4.68	1046/1572	4.68	4.51	4.70	4.79	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	1	9	10	4.18	1010/1564	4.18	4.06	4.28	4.40	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	0	4	15	4.43	804/1559	4.43	4.06	4.29	4.41	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	1	9	9	4.25	515/1352	4.25	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1137/1384	3.38	3.91	4.08	4.35	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	1216/1382	3.50	4.01	4.29	4.56	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1181/1368	3.50	3.99	4.30	4.58	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 23 Non-major 16
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 442 0101  
 Title DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: BREWSTER, RACHE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 213  
 Questionnaires: 87

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 225  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	4	15	26	38	4.14	1076/1649	4.14	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	7	23	31	23	3.83	1287/1648	3.83	3.98	4.23	4.36	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	11	24	28	19	3.64	1159/1375	3.64	3.97	4.27	4.48	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	64	2	1	6	5	4	3.44	****/1595	****	3.99	4.20	4.36	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	7	15	10	26	16	7	2.86	1481/1533	2.86	3.81	4.04	4.14	2.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	64	1	2	5	5	4	3.53	****/1512	****	3.83	4.10	4.26	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	3	2	29	21	26	3.80	1241/1623	3.80	4.00	4.16	4.27	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	1	0	0	1	0	78	4.97	199/1646	4.97	4.82	4.69	4.71	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	2	8	38	26	4.19	766/1621	3.55	3.86	4.06	4.24	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	3	18	60	4.67	620/1568	4.29	4.32	4.43	4.54	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	3	11	67	4.79	858/1572	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.79	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	3	6	26	46	4.42	767/1564	3.82	4.06	4.28	4.40	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	7	15	57	4.60	586/1559	4.05	4.06	4.29	4.41	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	1	5	5	16	46	4.38	415/1352	4.01	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.01	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	71	0	3	1	5	3	4	3.25	****/1384	****	3.91	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	72	0	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	****/1382	****	4.01	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	73	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	****/1368	****	3.99	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	74	6	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	86	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.36	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	86	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.39	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 212	****	4.56	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 209	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	82	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	86	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	79	0	1	2	0	4	1	3.25	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 442 0101  
 Title DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: BREWSTER, RACHE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 213  
 Questionnaires: 87

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 225  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	76
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	87	Non-major	11
84-150	39	3.00-3.49	16	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	66				
				?	2						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	4	15	26	38	4.14	1076/1649	4.14	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	7	23	31	23	3.83	1287/1648	3.83	3.98	4.23	4.36	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	11	24	28	19	3.64	1159/1375	3.64	3.97	4.27	4.48	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	64	2	1	6	5	4	3.44	****/1595	****	3.99	4.20	4.36	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	7	15	10	26	16	7	2.86	1481/1533	2.86	3.81	4.04	4.14	2.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	64	1	2	5	5	4	3.53	****/1512	****	3.83	4.10	4.26	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	3	2	29	21	26	3.80	1241/1623	3.80	4.00	4.16	4.27	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	1	0	0	1	0	78	4.97	199/1646	4.97	4.82	4.69	4.71	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	9	11	35	13	5	2.92	1531/1621	3.55	3.86	4.06	4.24	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	4	7	14	18	33	3.91	1347/1568	4.29	4.32	4.43	4.54	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	3	5	7	20	40	4.19	1422/1572	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.79	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	10	11	22	16	16	3.23	1467/1564	3.82	4.06	4.28	4.40	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	11	6	17	14	25	3.49	1373/1559	4.05	4.06	4.29	4.41	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	11	6	6	16	12	23	3.63	986/1352	4.01	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.01	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	71	0	3	1	5	3	4	3.25	****/1384	****	3.91	4.08	4.35	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	72	0	1	2	4	3	5	3.60	****/1382	****	4.01	4.29	4.56	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	73	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	****/1368	****	3.99	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	74	6	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	86	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.36	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	86	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.39	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 212	****	4.56	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 209	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	82	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	86	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	79	0	1	2	0	4	1	3.25	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 442 0101  
 Title DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: EISENMANN, DAVI (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 213  
 Questionnaires: 87

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 226  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	76
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	11	General	2	Under-grad	87	Non-major	11
84-150	39	3.00-3.49	16	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	66				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 444 0101  
 Title DEVELOPMENT AND CANCER  
 Instructor: BIEBERICH, CHAR  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 227  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	203/1649	4.89	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	362/1648	4.67	3.98	4.23	4.36	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	271/1375	4.78	3.97	4.27	4.48	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	321/1595	4.67	3.99	4.20	4.36	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	115/1533	4.89	3.81	4.04	4.14	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	179/1512	4.78	3.83	4.10	4.26	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	581/1623	4.44	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1249/1646	4.44	4.82	4.69	4.71	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	113/1621	4.86	3.86	4.06	4.24	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	273/1568	4.89	4.32	4.43	4.54	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.51	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	187/1564	4.89	4.06	4.28	4.40	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	361/1559	4.78	4.06	4.29	4.41	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/1352	4.83	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	175/1384	4.86	3.91	4.08	4.35	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.01	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1368	4.86	3.99	4.30	4.58	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	601/ 948	3.75	3.64	3.95	4.31	3.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 2
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		



Course-Section: BIOL 451 0101  
 Title NEUROBIOLOGY  
 Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYLL  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 228  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	762/1649	4.42	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1076/1648	4.08	3.98	4.23	4.36	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	875/1375	4.17	3.97	4.27	4.48	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.99	4.20	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	624/1533	4.25	3.81	4.04	4.14	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	380/1512	4.50	3.83	4.10	4.26	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	597/1646	4.92	4.82	4.69	4.71	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	859/1621	4.10	3.86	4.06	4.24	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1248/1568	4.08	4.32	4.43	4.54	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.51	4.70	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.06	4.28	4.40	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.06	4.29	4.41	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	650/1352	4.08	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1384	4.50	3.91	4.08	4.35	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.01	4.29	4.56	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1368	****	3.99	4.30	4.58	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	342/ 948	4.25	3.64	3.95	4.31	4.25	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.41	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 451 0101  
 Title Neurobiology  
 Instructor: Lin, Weihong  
 Enrollment: 0  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 14  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	954/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	3	3	5	3.60	1448/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	1	5	5	3.71	1132/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	6	5	3.80	1260/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1036/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	1055/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1252/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	8	0	3.54	1332/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	1031/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	1003/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	4	4	3	3	3.36	1437/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	3.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	5	1	4	3.29	1435/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	3.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	590/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	****	4.01	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	217/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	3.50	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	94/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.83	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 476 0101  
 Title ANTIBIOTICS  
 Instructor: LOVETT, PAUL S  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 229  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	130/1649	4.93	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	797/1648	4.33	3.98	4.23	4.36	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	521/1375	4.53	3.97	4.27	4.48	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	608/1595	4.43	3.99	4.20	4.36	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	410/1533	4.47	3.81	4.04	4.14	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	994/1512	3.92	3.83	4.10	4.26	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	994/1623	4.07	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	687/1621	4.25	3.86	4.06	4.24	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	956/1568	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.54	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	473/1572	4.93	4.51	4.70	4.79	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	833/1564	4.36	4.06	4.28	4.40	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	536/1559	4.64	4.06	4.29	4.41	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	644/1352	4.08	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	795/1384	4.00	3.91	4.08	4.35	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1382	4.71	4.01	4.29	4.56	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	472/1368	4.71	3.99	4.30	4.58	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 4 Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	8 Under-grad 11 Non-major 9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101  
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES  
 Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 230  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	550/1649	4.57	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	943/1648	4.21	3.98	4.23	4.36	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	641/1375	4.43	3.97	4.27	4.48	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	417/1595	4.57	3.99	4.20	4.36	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	342/1533	4.54	3.81	4.04	4.14	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	493/1512	4.43	3.83	4.10	4.26	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	608/1623	4.43	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	531/1646	4.92	4.82	4.69	4.71	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	159/1621	4.58	3.86	4.06	4.24	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	196/1568	4.74	4.32	4.43	4.54	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.51	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.06	4.28	4.40	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	164/1559	4.76	4.06	4.29	4.41	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	286/1352	4.58	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	343/1384	4.64	3.91	4.08	4.35	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	362/1382	4.79	4.01	4.29	4.56	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	472/1368	4.71	3.99	4.30	4.58	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	3.64	3.95	4.31	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	29/ 221	4.77	4.36	4.16	4.73	4.77	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	33/ 243	4.77	4.39	4.12	4.61	4.77	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	43/ 212	4.83	4.56	4.40	4.57	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	87/ 209	4.62	4.50	4.35	4.63	4.62	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	252/ 555	4.75	4.17	4.29	4.41	4.75	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	2	0	4	0	3.33	208/ 288	3.33	3.63	3.68	3.71	3.33	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	6	0	3.71	200/ 312	3.71	3.86	3.68	3.95	3.71	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101  
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES  
 Instructor: MENDELSON, TAMR (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 231  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	550/1649	4.57	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	943/1648	4.21	3.98	4.23	4.36	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	641/1375	4.43	3.97	4.27	4.48	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	417/1595	4.57	3.99	4.20	4.36	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	342/1533	4.54	3.81	4.04	4.14	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	493/1512	4.43	3.83	4.10	4.26	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	608/1623	4.43	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	531/1646	4.92	4.82	4.69	4.71	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	279/1621	4.58	3.86	4.06	4.24	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	554/1568	4.74	4.32	4.43	4.54	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.51	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	294/1564	4.71	4.06	4.28	4.40	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	536/1559	4.76	4.06	4.29	4.41	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	263/1352	4.58	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	343/1384	4.64	3.91	4.08	4.35	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	362/1382	4.79	4.01	4.29	4.56	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	472/1368	4.71	3.99	4.30	4.58	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	3.64	3.95	4.31	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	29/ 221	4.77	4.36	4.16	4.73	4.77	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	33/ 243	4.77	4.39	4.12	4.61	4.77	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	43/ 212	4.83	4.56	4.40	4.57	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	87/ 209	4.62	4.50	4.35	4.63	4.62	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	252/ 555	4.75	4.17	4.29	4.41	4.75	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	2	0	4	0	3.33	208/ 288	3.33	3.63	3.68	3.71	3.33	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	6	0	3.71	200/ 312	3.71	3.86	3.68	3.95	3.71	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101  
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 232  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	550/1649	4.57	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	943/1648	4.21	3.98	4.23	4.36	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	641/1375	4.43	3.97	4.27	4.48	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	417/1595	4.57	3.99	4.20	4.36	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	342/1533	4.54	3.81	4.04	4.14	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	493/1512	4.43	3.83	4.10	4.26	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	608/1623	4.43	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	531/1646	4.92	4.82	4.69	4.71	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	571/1621	4.58	3.86	4.06	4.24	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	767/1568	4.74	4.32	4.43	4.54	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.51	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	498/1564	4.71	4.06	4.28	4.40	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	448/1559	4.76	4.06	4.29	4.41	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	240/1352	4.58	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	343/1384	4.64	3.91	4.08	4.35	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	362/1382	4.79	4.01	4.29	4.56	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	472/1368	4.71	3.99	4.30	4.58	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	3.64	3.95	4.31	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	29/ 221	4.77	4.36	4.16	4.73	4.77	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	33/ 243	4.77	4.39	4.12	4.61	4.77	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	43/ 212	4.83	4.56	4.40	4.57	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	87/ 209	4.62	4.50	4.35	4.63	4.62	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	252/ 555	4.75	4.17	4.29	4.41	4.75	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	2	0	4	0	3.33	208/ 288	3.33	3.63	3.68	3.71	3.33	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	6	0	3.71	200/ 312	3.71	3.86	3.68	3.95	3.71	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 635L 0101  
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB  
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 233  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	361/1649	4.73	4.16	4.28	4.46	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	629/1648	4.45	3.98	4.23	4.34	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	334/1375	4.73	3.97	4.27	4.44	4.73		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1595	5.00	3.99	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	476/1533	4.40	3.81	4.04	4.28	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	553/1512	4.38	3.83	4.10	4.35	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	979/1623	4.10	4.00	4.16	4.29	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.29	3.86	4.06	4.20	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	636/1568	4.46	4.32	4.43	4.52	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	765/1572	4.62	4.51	4.70	4.83	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	651/1564	4.38	4.06	4.28	4.41	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	318/1559	4.23	4.06	4.29	4.41	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.02	3.98	4.10	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.91	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.01	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.99	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	20/ 221	4.91	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.91	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	53/ 243	4.64	4.39	4.12	4.61	4.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	124/ 212	4.36	4.56	4.40	4.73	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	81/ 209	4.64	4.50	4.35	4.80	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	238/ 555	4.80	4.17	4.29	4.66	4.80	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.86	3.68	3.83	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 635L 0101  
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 234  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3								4	5
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	361/1649	4.73	4.16	4.28	4.46	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	629/1648	4.45	3.98	4.23	4.34	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	334/1375	4.73	3.97	4.27	4.44	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1595	5.00	3.99	4.20	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	476/1533	4.40	3.81	4.04	4.28	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	553/1512	4.38	3.83	4.10	4.35	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	979/1623	4.10	4.00	4.16	4.29	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	914/1621	4.29	3.86	4.06	4.20	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1121/1568	4.46	4.32	4.43	4.52	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1321/1572	4.62	4.51	4.70	4.83	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	939/1564	4.38	4.06	4.28	4.41	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1322/1559	4.23	4.06	4.29	4.41	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1352	5.00	4.02	3.98	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.91	4.08	4.30	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.01	4.29	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.99	4.30	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95	4.03	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	20/ 221	4.91	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.91
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	53/ 243	4.64	4.39	4.12	4.61	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	124/ 212	4.36	4.56	4.40	4.73	4.36
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	81/ 209	4.64	4.50	4.35	4.80	4.64
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	238/ 555	4.80	4.17	4.29	4.66	4.80
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.86	3.68	3.83	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: BIOL 700 0101  
 Title INTRO TO GRAD EXPERIEN  
 Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 235  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	471/1649	4.64	4.16	4.28	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	510/1648	4.55	3.98	4.23	4.34	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	950/1375	4.00	3.97	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	174/1595	4.83	3.99	4.20	4.35	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	432/1533	4.44	3.81	4.04	4.28	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.83	4.10	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.00	4.16	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	816/1646	4.82	4.82	4.69	4.81	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	789/1621	4.17	3.86	4.06	4.20	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.32	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.51	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.06	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.06	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	351/1384	4.64	3.91	4.08	4.30	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	332/1382	4.82	4.01	4.29	4.52	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1368	5.00	3.99	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	164/ 948	4.63	3.64	3.95	4.03	4.63	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	485/ 555	3.25	4.17	4.29	4.66	3.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	30/ 88	4.89	4.82	4.54	4.63	4.89	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	2	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	54/ 85	4.43	4.21	4.47	4.50	4.43	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	73/ 81	3.75	3.88	4.43	4.43	3.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	38/ 92	4.56	4.15	4.35	4.42	4.56	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	37/ 288	4.50	3.63	3.68	3.87	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	3						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						