Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL

Enrollment: 282 Questionnaires: 221 Fall 2008

University of Maryland Page 170
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	es 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect 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		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		1281/1623	4.07	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	1		121	84		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		140	4.48	891/1568		4.32	4.43	4.39	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	2 13	5 11	14 45	29 62	157 71		1133/1572	4.73	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.61 3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19 16	0	16	13	34	o∠ 55	71 87		1262/1564 1201/1559	4.24 4.30	4.06 4.06	4.28	4.20	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	0	13	16	33	51			805/1352			3.98		3.90
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your didenstanding	21	U	13	10	33	31	07	3.71	003/1332	4.21	1.02	3.90	3.00	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	14	16	29	55	85	3.91	886/1384		3.91	4.08	3.86	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	5	11	25		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		****/ 212	****	4.56	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	210	5	1	1	2	2	0		****/ 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		****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	213	2	0	2	1	2	1		****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	213	3	0	0	3	1	1		****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	213 205	2	0	2	1 2	2 5	1 1		****/ 92 ****/ 288	****	4.15 3.63	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	205	3	4	3	۷	5		3.00	/ 200		3.03	3.00	3.34	
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	3.73	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	217	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.73	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	217	0	0	1	1	1	1		****/ 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		****/ 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	****

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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d 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	В	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	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	ŗh
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	1	Other	172	-			
				?	9						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 211
Questionnaires: 136

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 171 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		3.97	4.27	4.10	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	50	4	5	11	17	39		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		1084/1533	4.01	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		91	5	2	7	7	12		****/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		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		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		4.06	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		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		****/ 209	****	4.50	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	123	2	0	1	4	0	6		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 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	****
		_	-	_	-	_	_		, 312					
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	****

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

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d 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	В	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	s there	are not enoug	ŗh
				P	0			responses to	o be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	70	-			
				?	2						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 24

Ouestionnaires: 22

Fall 2008

University of Maryland
Baltimore County

Page 172

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 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 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 1 3 4 3.14 1232/1384 3.09 3.91 4.08 3.86 3.14 4 2.93 1338/1382 3.21 4.01 4.29 4.03 2.93 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 3 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 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 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 Ω 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 1 4.50 ****/ 88 **** 4.82 4.54 4.31 **** 0 2.50 ****/ 85 **** 4.21 4.47 4.30 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 20 0 0 1 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 81 **** 3.88 4.43 4.39 **** 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 ****/ 92 **** 4.15 4.35 4.01 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 20 0 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 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** **** 4.06 3.72 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 3.65 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation $20 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1.00 **** / 39 **** **** 4.47 4.36 ****$ 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 1.00 ****/ 312 **** 3.86 3.68 3.51 **** Self Paced 0 1.00 ****/ 53 **** **** 4.30 4.17 **** 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 21 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.16 4.06 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 21 0 1 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 ****

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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	_			
				?	0						

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment:

23 Questionnaires: 20 Fall 2008

Page 173 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	Questions						NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 General																	
1 Did vo	u dain new	insights, skil		his cours	:e	0	0	3	3	8	6	0	2 85	1625/1649	3 41	4.16	4.28	4.11	2.85
_	_	or make clear				0	0	2	5	9	3	1		1612/1648		3.98	4.23	4.16	2.80
		stions reflect				0	0	5	8	3	3	1		1369/1375	3.41	3.97	4.27	4.10	2.35
		tions reflect				0	0	4	3	9	3	1		1574/1595		3.99	4.20	4.03	2.70
		dings contribu	_	_		0	1	3	3	5	6	2		1432/1533		3.81	4.04	3.87	3.05
		gnments contri				1	0	3	4	5	6	1	2.89	1460/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	2.89
	-	system clearly		-		0	0	2	5	7	2	4	3.05	1528/1623	3.62	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.05
8. How max	ny times wa	as class cance	lled			0	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	1325/1646	4.73	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.35
9. How wo	uld you gra	ade the overal	l teachir	ng effecti	veness	5	1	4	2	7	1	0	2.36	1601/1621	3.03	3.86	4.06	3.96	2.36
		Lecture																	
1. Were t	he instruct	tor's lectures	well pre	epared		0	0	3	2	7	7	1	3.05	1512/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	3.05
2. Did th	e instructo	or seem intere	sted in t	the subject	et	1	0	3	2	3	7	4	3.37	1545/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64	3.37
3. Was le	cture mate	rial presented	and expl	lained cle	early	2	0	4	6	2	6	0	2.56	1544/1564	3.56	4.06	4.28	4.20	2.56
4. Did th	e lectures	contribute to	what you	ı learned		1	1	10	1	4	2	1	2.06	1548/1559	3.13	4.06	4.29	4.20	2.06
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	ance your	r understa	anding	2	1	3	2	8	4	0	2.76	1275/1352	3.37	4.02	3.98	3.86	2.76
	Discussion d class discussions contribute to what you learn																		
	id class discussions contribute to what you learn					14	0	3	0	2	0	1		1355/1384		3.91	4.08	3.86	2.33
	d class discussions contribute to what you learn re all students actively encouraged to participa					14	0	1	3	1	0	1	2.50	1363/1382		4.01	4.29	4.03	2.50
		or encourage f		open discu	ıssion	13	0	2	1	3	0			1344/1368		3.99	4.30	4.01	2.57
4. Were s	pecial tech	hniques succes	sful			13	2	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	931/ 948	2.92	3.64	3.95	3.75	2.20
		Laborat	ory																
		ease understan	_			3	0	1	2	4	9	1	3.41	,		4.36	4.16	4.05	3.41
_	_	d with adequat	_			3	0	2	0	5	6		3.59	201/ 243		4.39	4.12	4.08	3.59
	_	aterials avail			rities	4	0	1	1	1	5		4.13	146/ 212		4.56	4.40	4.43	4.13
		ructor provide				4	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	121/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.38
5. Were r	equirement	s for lab repo	rts clear	rly specif	ied	4	0	3	4	2	4	3	3.00	490/ 555	3.73	4.17	4.29	4.14	3.00
_		Seminar																	
5. Were c	riteria fo	r grading made	clear			19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	3.45	3.63	3.68	3.54	****
		Field W									_	•							
5. Dia co	nierences i	help you carry	out fiel	ld activit	cies	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	***	3.86	3.68	3.51	****
	Fr							trib	utior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad									Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1		 Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 5	 2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majc	or	7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	6														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	8		Ge	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	10	Non-	major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	h
				P	0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I	0		Ot	her				1	5						
				?	1														

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

			Fre	mier	cies			Tnet	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Ouestions	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		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			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			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		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		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		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		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		****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/ 288	3.45		3.68	3.54	****
									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 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		****/ 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	***

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				?	0						

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

			Fr	eanei	ncies			Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	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		1480/1533	3.47	3.81	4.04	3.87	2.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne		0	2	4	5	5	1		1446/1512		3.83	4.10	3.86	2.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	5	4		1401/1623		4.00	4.16	4.08	3.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1			897/1646		4.82	4.69	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 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		1246/1352		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		1233/1382	3.21	4.01	4.29	4.03	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	3	0	1	4	2		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	,		3.64		3.75	
1. Wele special commiques successful	J	_	-	2	-	Ü	Ü	2.25	J2J, J10	2.72	3.01	3.75	3.73	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		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		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		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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	****

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

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	0						

CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Title Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 22

Fall 2008 Questionnaires: 16

Page 176 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
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		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		1419/1564	3.56	4.06	4.70	4.20	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	5	2	3		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	-		,	3.13	4.00			3.31
5. Did addiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	3	U	_	3	3	3	3	3.31	1143/1332	3.31	4.02	3.90	3.00	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	4	3			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		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		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		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		4.14
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	
Seminar	13	0	0	2	0	0	1	2 00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4 54	4 21	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	,	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 85 ****/ 81	****	3.88	4.47 4.43	4.30 4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.15	4.43	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	253/ 288	3.45	3.63		3.54	
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	12	U	U	2	4	U	U	2.50	255/ 200	3.43	3.03	3.00	3.34	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		****/ 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		****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	1	1	0		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****
J. Here effecte effought proceeds for all the seudenes		5	J		_	1	U	5.00	, 110			3.22	5.05	

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 16

Baltimore County CLAASSEN, LARK Fall 2008

Page 176 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-		_	
				?	0						

CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Title 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
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	eanei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect.
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
~ 														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		1522/1595		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		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	R	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		1352/1572		4.51	4.70		4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	4	4	5		1096/1564		4.06	4.28	4.20	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	4	4		1226/1559	3.13		4.29	4.20	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	690/1352			3.98		4.00
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	J	U	_	U	2	U	J	4.00	050/1332	3.37	4.02	3.90	3.00	1.00
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
T albania b anna														
Laboratory	0	0	^	0	2	_	0	2 44	106/ 001	2 00	1 20	1 10	4 05	2 44
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	2	3	2 1	3	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		-	3.56	204/ 243	4.06	4.39	4.12	4.08	3.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8		0		1	2	6 4	4.56	99/ 212	4.43	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	3	1	2	2	-	4.00	151/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	U	3	U	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														
	1.0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 39	****	****	1 20	1 27	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	0	0	0	0		,			4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	U	U	U	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	****

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

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

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment:

22

Questionnaires: 18

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 178 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questions			Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	6	7		1327/1649			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		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 2	6	6		1032/1595	3.31	3.99	4.20	4.03	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4		4	7	3.82	996/1533		3.81	4.04	3.87	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	U T	4 1	2 1	4	6	3.59 4.47	1214/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	T	0	11 15		541/1623	3.62	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3 6	1	1	1	2	6	15 1	5.00	1/1646		4.82	4.69	4.67	5.00 3.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	ь	Τ	Т	Т	2	ь	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		1137/1384		3.91	4.08	3.86	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	2	0	3		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		1154/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	
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		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
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64			4.17	4.29	4.14	
or note requirements for tax reports ereally specified	•	ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	_	Ü	1.01	277, 333	3.73		1.27		1.01
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		****/ 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	****	****	1 00	3.72	****
2. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17 17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 312		3.86	3.68		****
J. Did contelences help you carry out fletd accivities	Τ/	U	Τ	U	U	U	U	1.00	/ 312		3.00	3.00	3.31	
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	****
<del>_</del>														

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				?	1						

CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Title CLAASSEN, LARK

Instructor:

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 179

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		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	,	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		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		1234/1512	3.26	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.56
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	1	0	0	2	3	7	7		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			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
T a whoma														
Lecture	1	0	0	0	_	_	0	1 10	1100/1560	2 04	4 20	1 12	4 20	1 16
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1 2	-	-	-	5	6	8		1198/1568	3.94		4.43	4.39	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	0	1 1	2	9	6		1445/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1 2	0		2	4 5	8 4	6 3		1127/1564	3.56	4.06	4.28	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	3 2	0	5 6	4 5	_		1466/1559 996/1352	3.13 3.37	4.06 4.02	4.29	4.20 3.86	3.12 3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	U	2	U	О	5	5	3.61	990/1352	3.3/	4.02	3.98	3.80	3.01
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		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		1260/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	1	1	1	1			776/ 948		3.64			3.33
1. Hold Special Countifued Successful			_	_	_	_	_	3.33	, , , , , , ,	2.,,	3.01	3.75	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		****/ 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	,	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	1	2		****/ 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.	^	_	0	^	_	_	4 00	****	****	4.4.4.4.	4 20	4 10	
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	****

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 20

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 179 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0203 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 180 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque:	ncies	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from 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		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
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3					or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	 Majo		 5

Credits E	arned	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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				2	1						

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

							Fre	eque	ncies	\$		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,skil		this course	0	0	0	1	9	5	4	3.63	1450/1649	3.41	4.16	4.28	4.11	3.63
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	2	4	3	4	6		1517/1648	3.40		4.23	4.16	3.42
		estions reflect			1	0	1	3	4	5	5		1188/1375			4.27		
		ations reflect			1	0	2	3	2	5			1384/1595	3.31		4.20	4.03	3.56
		adings contribu	_	_	2	0	0	0	5	6			781/1533		3.81			4.06
				what you learned	2	0	1	3		6			1314/1512		3.83		3.86	
		system clearly			2	0	1	1	2				1029/1623		4.00		4.08	4.00
		was class cance		.ca	2	1	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646		4.82		4.67	
				ng effectiveness	7	0	1	1	6	3			1473/1621					
		Lecture	<u>:</u>															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	well pr	repared	5	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	1248/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.07
		tor seem intere			5	0	0	2	2	5			1486/1572		4.51		4.64	
		erial presented			5	0	2	1	1	6			1344/1564		4.06	4.28	4.20	
		s contribute to		6	1	4	2	1	2			1510/1559			4.29	4.20		
		r understanding	6	1	1	1	3	5			1049/1352							
o. Dia au	ulovisuai	. ceciniiques em	ir understanding	0	1		1	3	5	۷	3.30	1049/1332	3.37	4.02	3.90	3.00	3.30	
1 Did al.	aga digan	Discuss Issions contribu		unt row loowned	14	0	1	1	0	1	2	2 40	1122/1384	3.09	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.40
		its actively end		14	0	0	0	1	0			540/1382				4.03	4.60	
						0	1	-	_	-					4.01			
1. Were sp	open discussion	14 13	1	0	0 1	1 0	2			1206/1368 281/ 948		3.99	4.30	4.01 3.75				
	F					_	-	_	-	-	_							
		Laborat	_		_					_	_						4 05	4 00
		rease understan	_		6	0	0	0	2	6		4.23				4.16	4.05	4.23
				ound information	6	0	0	1	1	4			117/ 243		4.39	4.12	4.08	
				lab activities	6	0	0	0	0			4.77	62/ 212			4.40	4.43	
		tructor provide			6	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	52/ 209	4.17	4.50	4.35	4.38	
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab repo	rts clea	rly 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 c	riteria f	or grading made	clear		18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	3.45	3.63	3.68	3.54	****
		Field W																
5. Did com	nferences	help you carry	out fie	eld activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	;			
00-27						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	` `S	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	в 8						-								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 2		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									3				~	
Grad.					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh	
P 0											respons				_	•		
				I O		Oth	her				1	.0		2				
				? 1		001					_	-						
				? 1														

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 17

# Fall 2008

Page 182 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Fre	eaner	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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
T a selection														
Lecture	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	1 21	1070/1560	2 04	4 20	1 12	4 20	4 21
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2 2	7	10		1070/1568		4.32	4.43	4.39	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4 8	10 7	4.38	1241/1572	4.01	4.51	4.70	4.64 4.20	4.50 4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1 1	3	0	0	2	5		4.38	812/1564 931/1559	3.56	4.06	4.28 4.29		4.38
	2	3	1	0	2	8	1	3.67		3.13	4.06	3.98	4.20	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	Т	U	2	8	Τ.	3.07	970/1352	3.37	4.02	3.98	3.86	3.07
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		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		1229/1368	3.06	3.99	4.30	4.01	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 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		****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 288		3.63	3.68	3.54	****
5. Here offeeria for grading made ofedr		_	ŭ	Ü	Ü	Ū	_	3.00	, 200	3.13	3.03	3.00	3.31	
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 -	0	0	0	-1	-1	0	2 50	++++/	***	****	4 20	4 10	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53 ****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.17	****
<ol> <li>Did study questions make clear the expected goal</li> <li>Were your contacts with the instructor helpful</li> </ol>	15	0 1	0	0	1	2	0	4.00	****/ 30 ****/ 41	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15 15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.43 4.42	4.27 4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15 15	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****
J. Were there enough proctors for all the students	TO	Т	U	Т	U	U	U	∠.00	/ 110			3.77	3.03	

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

Credits E	arned	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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				?	2						

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

			Fre	anıer	ncies			Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	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		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		****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	,	****	4.21	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 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				_	_							4 0 5		
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	,	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	2	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	2	0	0	0		****/ 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			•		_							4 0 5	4 4 5	
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		****	****	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	****

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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	 А	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				?	1						

Title HONRS UNIV INTR:LIFE S

11

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 9

Enrollment:

BULGER, MICHELL

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 184 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	mier	ncies			Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		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	****
	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
	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
	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
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	5		1193/1572	4.56	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.56
	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
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	2		1067/1559	4.11		4.29	4.20	4.11
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	3		3.83					3.86	3.83
	Discussion														
	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
	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
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3		4.63	560/1368		3.99		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	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 243	****	4.39	4.12	4.08	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 212	****	4.56	4.40	4.43	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 209	****	4.50	4.35	4.38	****
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.14	****
	4	-		-	-	_	-	-		, 555					
	Seminar														
	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
	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
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2		4.00	63/ 81	4.00		4.43	4.39	4.00
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	1		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	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.36	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.37	****
	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	_	_	6			-	•	4 00		44	4.4	4 00	4	
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 53	****	***	4.30	4.17	***
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 41	***	***	4.43	4.27	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8 8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	U	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	^^^*	* * * *	3.99	3.83	* * * * *

Title HONRS UNIV INTR:LIFE S

Instructor: BULGE

BULGER, MICHELL

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 9

V INTR:LIFE S Baltimore County ICHELL Fall 2008

Page 184 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	3	А	 5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	-		
				?	0						

THE HUMAN ORGANISM

Title Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 129 Questionnaires: 94 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 185 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	anie	ncie	g		Tngt	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	31	54	4.47	696/1649		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		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		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		3.99	4.20	4.03	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	29	11	9	14	14	17		1362/1533		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	****
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	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		4.51	4.70	4.64	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	_	18	66	4.67	473/1564		4.06	4.28	4.20	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	14	73	4.76	390/1559		4.06	4.29	4.20	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	13	1	3	7	12	53	4.76	322/1352		4.00	3.98	3.86	4.76
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13		3	,	12	55	4.42	322/1332	4.49	4.02	3.90	3.00	4.43
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	****
~ 1 · ·														
Laboratory	0.4	0	0	_	•	-	-	4 50	**** / 001	ale ale ale ale	4 26	4 16	4 05	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	84	8	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 221	****	4.36	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	87	0	3	1	0	1	2		****/ 243	****	4.39	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	87	6	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	4.56	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	87	6	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 85	***	4.21	4.47	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	86	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	0.0	0	2	0	•	0	-	0 65	= 0	ale ale ale d	****	4 0 =	2 50	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	88	0	3	0	0	2	Ţ		****/ 52	****		4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	88	0	2	0	1	0	3		****/ 48		****	4.09	3.65	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	87	5	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	86	3	1	0	0	1	3		****/ 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		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****
		-			-				,					

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

Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	 А	15	Required for Majors	49	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	В	32						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	23	General	5	Under-grad	94	Non-major	94
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	19	-			
				?	3						

LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO

Title

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

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	8	3	2	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		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		1357/1375		3.97	4.27	4.10	2.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	6	5	3		1270/1595		3.99	4.20	4.03	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	3	4			1441/1533		3.81	4.04	3.87	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	3	3	3	2		1428/1512		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		1003/1572		4.51	4.70	4.64	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	4	5	2	3		1452/1564		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		1086/1382		4.01	4.29	4.03	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	2	2	3		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		4.39	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	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	1						

Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO

Instructor:

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2008 AKINMADE, DAMIL

Page 187 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

			Questions			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Di	4 27011	gain nou	General insights,skil		thia gourgo	0	0	6	5	1	2	2	2 21	1645/1649	3.05	4.16	4.28	4.11	2.31
			or make clear			0	0	5	4	3	2	2		1633/1648	2.99	3.98	4.23	4.11	2.50
			stions reflect	_	_	0	0	8	4	3	0	1		1373/1375	2.38	3.97	4.23	4.10	1.88
		_	tions reflect	_	_	0	0	6	3	1	3	3		1579/1595	3.30	3.99	4.20	4.03	2.63
				_	at you learned	0	0	4	7	2	0	3		1515/1533	3.04	3.81	4.04	3.87	2.44
					what you learned		0	5	5	2	3	1		1499/1512	2.90	3.83	4.10	3.86	2.38
			-		_	0	0	5 4	5 6	3	1	_		, -					
		-	system clearly	_	.ea	0	-	-	-	3	_	2		1603/1623	3.09	4.00	4.16	4.08	2.44
			as class cance		55	0	0	0	0 3	0		15		465/1646	4.95	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.94
9. Ho	w wou	1a you gr	ade the overal	1 teacni	ng effectiveness	3	1	4	3	Ü	4	Τ	2.58	1579/1621	2.81	3.86	4.06	3.96	2.58
			Lecture																
			tor's lectures			2	0	3	1	2	3	5	3.43	1476/1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	3.43
2. Di	d the	instruct	or seem intere	sted 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. Wa	Was lecture material presented and explained clear old the lectures contribute to what you learned old audiovisual techniques enhance your understan					1	0	4	3	3	3	2	2.73	1535/1564	3.13	4.06	4.28	4.20	2.73
4. Di						0	0	6	4	1	2	3	2.50	1528/1559	3.17	4.06	4.29	4.20	2.50
5. Di	.d aud	iovisual	r understanding	1	0	3	1	5	1	5	3.27	1156/1352	3.83	4.02	3.98	3.86	3.27		
			Discuss																
1 Di	d cla	ee dienne		at vou learned	7	0	1	3	1	2	2	3 11	1244/1384	3.33	3.91	4.08	3.86	3.11	
				ons contribute to what you learned					2	1	2	3		1226/1382	3.85	4.01	4.29	4.03	3.44
				sions contribute to what you learned s actively encouraged to participate or encourage fair and open discussion					1	1	2	4		1085/1368	3.69	3.99	4.30		3.78
			hniques succes		open discussion	7 7	0 3	1 4	0	0	0	2		926/ 948				3.75	
			Laborat	-															
			ease understan			4	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	129/ 221	4.19	4.36	4.16	4.05	4.00
					ound information	4	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	128/ 243	4.46	4.39	4.12	4.08	4.25
					lab activities	4	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	120/ 212	4.64	4.56	4.40	4.43	4.42
			ructor provide			4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	52/ 209	4.38	4.50	4.35	4.38	4.75
5. We	re re	quirement	s for lab repo	rts clea	rly specified	4	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	355/ 555	4.34	4.17	4.29	4.14	4.25
			Field W	ork															
5. Di	d con	ferences	help you carry	out fie	ld activities	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****
								ribu	ution	1									
			_	1	-20														
Credi	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra								Rea	sons				Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-2	27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Rec	quire	ed fo	r Maj	jors	\$	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-5	55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 6														
56-8	13	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General						0	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	16	
84-1	.50	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad	l.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h	
					P 0								respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt		
					I 0		Oth	ner					2						
					? 1														

LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO

Title AKINMADE, DAMIL

Instructor: Enrollment:

23 Questionnaires: 12 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 188 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	eauer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC:	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4			1281/1572	4.34	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.45
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	2			1472/1564	3.13	4.06	4.28	4.20	3.20
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	3	2			1448/1559	3.17		4.29	4.20	3.20
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	5	2			818/1352				3.86	
		_	-	-	-	_	_	_		0-0, -00-					
	Discussion														
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1384		3.91	4.08	3.86	****
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1382	3.85		4.29	4.03	****
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0			****/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
	Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	3		4.50	65/ 243	4.46	4.39	4.12	4.08	4.50
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	4		4.60	94/ 212	4.64		4.40	4.43	4.60
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	2	2		4.40	116/ 209		4.50			4.40
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	323/ 555		4.17		4.14	
٥.	were requirements for tab reports creatify specified	_	Ü	Ü	_	_	_	,	1.10	3237 333	1.51	1.1,	1.25	1.11	1.10
	Seminar														
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.31	****
	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	E 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.72	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	3.65	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****		4.36	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.47 4.38	4.36	****
		11	0	0	0	0	0	•		****/ 312	****	3.86		3.51	****
٥.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	ТТ	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 312		3.00	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	****

Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO

Instructor: AKINMADE, DAMIL

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 12

: INTRO TO MOD BIO Baltimore County MADE, DAMIL Fall 2008

Page 188 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	are not enough	h	
				P	0		u #### - Means responses to		be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	1						

Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO

Questions

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

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

		Genera	l																	
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	this cour	se	0	0	1	2	5	4	4	3.50	1498/	1649	3.05	4.16	4.28	4.11	3.50
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the expe	cted goal	.s	0	0	1	2	7	2	4	3.38	1535/	1648	2.99	3.98	4.23	4.16	3.38
	_	estions reflect	_	_		0	0	2	4	5	3	2	2.94	1337/	1375	2.38	3.97	4.27	4.10	2.94
		ations reflect				0	0	1	2	3	6	4		1359/		3.30	3.99	4.20	4.03	3.63
		adings contrib				0	1	1	1	5	5	3		1228/		3.04	3.81	4.04	3.87	3.53
		ignments contr			learned	0	1	1	2	5	4	3		1320/		2.90	3.83	4.10	3.86	3.40
		system clearly		ied		0	0	1	1	6	1	7		1270/		3.09	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.75
		was class cance				0	0	0	0	0	1	15		465/		4.95	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.94
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teachi	ng effect	iveness	0	2	3	2	4	3	2	2.93	1528/	1621	2.81	3.86	4.06	3.96	2.93
		Lecture	2																	
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well pr	repared		0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1358/	1568	3.94	4.32	4.43	4.39	3.88
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested in	the subje	ect	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	1339/	1572	4.34	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.38
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	d and exp	lained cl	early	0	0	1	2	6	5	2	3.31	1445/	1564	3.13	4.06	4.28	4.20	3.31
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	what yo	u learned	l	0	0	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1336/	1559	3.17	4.06	4.29	4.20	3.63
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance you	ır underst	anding	1	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	655/	1352	3.83	4.02	3.98	3.86	4.07
		D																		
1 Did ala	acc dican	Discus: ssions contrib		at vou le	arned	7	0	0	2	1	5	1	3 56	1060/	1204	3.33	2 01	4.08	3.86	3.56
		ts actively en		_		7	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	774/		3.85	4.01	4.29	4.03	4.33
		tor encourage :				7	0	1	1	2	2	3		1162/		3.69	3.99	4.30	4.01	
		chniques succes		open dibe	.0551011	7	2	0	1	2	3			684/				3.95		
i. Were br	peciai ce	ciniiques succei	SSIUI			,	2	Ü	_	2	3	_	3.37	001/	J 10	3.12	3.01	3.75	3.73	3.37
		Labora	-																	
		rease understa	_			5	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36		221	4.19	4.36	4.16	4.05	4.36
		ed with adequat				5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73		243	4.46	4.39	4.12	4.08	4.73
	-	materials avai			vities	5	0	0	0	0	1		4.91	- /	212	4.64	4.56	4.40		4.91
		tructor provide				5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	112/		4.38	4.50	4.35		4.45
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts clea	ırly speci	fied	5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	308/	555	4.34	4.17	4.29	4.14	4.45
		Semina	c																	
5. Were ci	riteria f	or grading made	e clear			15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	288	****	3.63	3.68	3.54	****
		Field V	Work																	
5. Did cor	nferences	help you carry		eld activi	ties	13	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/	312	****	3.86	3.68	3.51	****
					Frequ	enav	Diet	rib	1+ i 01	2										
					rrequ	terrey	DISC	LIDU	10101	.1										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades				Rea	asons	5				Тур	e			Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А	3		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	.jor	 s 1	1	Gra	duate	:	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	6													-		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3		Ger	neral	L				0	Und	er-gr	ad 1	6	Non-	major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0															
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0		Ele	ectiv	res				1	###	# - M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	h
P 0														res	ponse	s to b	e sign	ifican	.t	
				I	0		Oth	ıer					1							
				?	0															

Course-Section: BIOL 215H 0101 University of Maryland Page 190 Title FEB 11, 2009

Baltimore County EBIOLOGY SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Instructor:

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

							Frequencies Ins				ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Sec			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mea
		 Genera																
Did vo	u dain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	0	0	Λ	7	7	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.16	4.28	4.29	4.5
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	475/1648		3.98	4.23	4.25	4.5
		uestions reflec			1	2	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	733/1375		3.97	4.27	4.37	4.
		uations reflect			1	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	497/1595		3.99	4.20	4.22	4.
				what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	703/1533		3.81	4.04	4.04	4.
	-	_		o what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	651/1512	4.29	3.83	4.10	4.14	4.
Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	1	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	994/1623	4.08	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.
How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.63	5.
How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	339/1621	4.49	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.
		Lectur	e															
. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	1	0	0	1	11	4.62	715/1568	4.45	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.51	4.70	4.73	5.
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	620/1564	4.27	4.06	4.28	4.27	4.
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	376/1559	4.53	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.
Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	120/1352	4.85	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.
		Discus	sion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							0	0	1	3	2	4.17	726/1384	4.17	3.91	4.08	3.99	4.
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.01	4.29	4.19	4.
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	654/1368		3.99	4.30	4.21	4.
Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		9	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	811/ 948	3.20	3.64	3.95	3.89	3.
		Labora	_															
		crease understa			1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	38/ 221	4.71	4.36	4.16	4.45	4.
				ground information	1	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	65/ 243		4.39	4.12	4.47	4.
	_			for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	77/ 212		4.56	4.40	4.62	4.
		structor provid			1	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	95/ 209		4.50	4.35	4.64	4.
Were r	equireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	1	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	293/ 555	4.50	4.17	4.29	4.33	4.
Wowo o	aaianad	Semina	_	e announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	2 75	**
. were a	issigned	copies relevant	to the	e announced theme	14	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 00		4.02	4.54	3.75	
				Frequ	lency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
redits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons						Ту	pe			Majors	3
 00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 8		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s:	7	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	
8-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 3														
6-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	1
4-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
rad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				2	#### -				_	յh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot!	her					4						
				? 0														

Course-Section: BIOL 215H 0101 University of Maryland Page 191 FEB 11, 2009 Title EBIOLOGY

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 18 Ouestionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 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 4.297. 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 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 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 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 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 4.503. 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 4.714. 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 4.575. 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 1 5.00 ****/ 88 **** 4.82 4.54 3.75 **** Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Credits Earned 

 00-27
 2
 0.00-0.99
 1
 A
 8

 28-55
 0
 1.00-1.99
 0
 B
 3

 56-83
 0
 2.00-2.99
 1
 C
 0

 84-150
 2
 3.00-3.49
 2
 D
 0

 Grad.
 0
 3.50-4.00
 0
 F
 0

 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 0 General 0 Under-grad 15 Non-major 15 F 0 Electives 2 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other ? 0

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES

Enrollment: 188
Questionnaires: 150

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 192 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	anie	ncie	S		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	11	0	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		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		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	2 60	****/1384	****	3.91	4.08	3.99	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	125	0	2	1	6	7	9		****/1382	****	4.01	4.29	4.19	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	125	0	2	0	8	3	12		****/1368	****	3.99	4.30	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	124	16	1	0	2	3	4		****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95		****
1. Were special teciniques successivi	121	10	1	U	2	5	-	3.90	/ 540		3.04	3.93	3.05	
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		****/ 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		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	149	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	144	1	0	1	0	4	0		****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.59	****
Calf David														
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	****	****	4.16	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	148	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.43	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	148	0	0	1	1	1	1		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****
J. Here there enough proceds for all the students	T-10	U	U	Т	т	т	Τ.	5.50	/ 110			3.22	5.14	

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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	;
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	25	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	ηh
				P	1			responses to	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	86	-			
				?	7						

ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Title Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 20

# Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 193 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	mier	ncies	2		Tnei	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	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		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		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			4.06	4.01	
	-	-	_		_	_	_		,					
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		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		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			1090/1352	4.15		3.98	4.07	3.88
o. Dia addiovidual ocominques cimanes four anaerseanaring		-	-	-	_	_	_	3.13	1070,1302	1.15	1.02	3.70	1.07	3.00
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		3.64		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		****/ 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	****

ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Title Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 23 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 193 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				?	1						

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 20

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 194 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	_	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	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		****/ 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	****

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 194 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	1	 Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				?	1						

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor:

(Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 195 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	23				
Questionnaires:	20	Stud	nt Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eauer	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	^	0	2	2	1 -	1 60	F10/1640	4 71	1 10	4 20	4 20	1 60
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0 4	3 4	2	15 9	4.60	510/1649 1271/1648	4.71 4.29	4.16 3.98	4.28	4.29 4.25	4.60 3.85
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>	0	0	1	1	6	3	9		1034/1375	4.29	3.98	4.23		3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	4	2	6		1231/1595	4.23	3.97	4.27	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	4.22	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	803/1512	4.27	4.00	4.16		4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	-	4.79	865/1646	4.91	4.82	4.69		4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	7	4		1078/1621				4.01	
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		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			1055/1564	4.34	4.06	4.28		4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	5	8		1009/1559	4.50	4.06	4.29		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		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		1069/1382	3.76	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		****/ 948		3.64			****
									, , ,					
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	1.00	****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		,	****	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			****	****	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	***

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor:

(Instr. C)

Page 195 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 20

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0102 University of Maryland

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore County Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 24 Ouestionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 196

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 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 4.007. 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 **** 16 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 ****/1382 3.96 4.01 4.29 4.19 **** 0 1 1 3 4.40 ****/1368 4.14 3.99 4.30 4.21 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 0 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 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 0 3.00 ****/ 81 **** 3.88 4.43 3.67 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.15 4.35 5.00 **** 20 0 1 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 1 5.00 **** / 52 **** **** 4.06 3.93 **** 20 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.09 4.05 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 20 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 39 **** **** 4.47 4.49 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 20 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 39 *** *** 4.38 3.66 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 3.86 3.68 3.59 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to		_	
				Т	0	Other	16	2		-	

? 1

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0102 University of Maryland Title FEB 11, 2009

ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 24 Ouestionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 197

Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 21 Student Cou	ırse	Eval	uatı	on Q	uest:	ıonn	aire							
				_	ncie		_		tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR 	NA	1 	2 	3 	-4 		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		4.83	765/1572		4.51	4.70	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	2		4.50	651/1564		4.06	4.28	4.27	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1		4.91			4.06	4.29	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	582/1352				4.07	
1														
Discussion	1.0	•	•	•	1	0	4	4 60	**** /1204	2 50	2 01	4 00	2 00	***
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	4		****/1384		3.91	4.08	3.99	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	3		****/1382		4.01	4.29	4.19	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	3		****/1368		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	4.73
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		****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	5.00	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 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		****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.09	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		****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.59	***
Frequ	ıenc;	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Tyj	pe			Majors	3
													- 	·
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 13		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	`s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	5

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Δ.	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				

? 1

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0102 University of Maryland FEB 11, 2009

Page 198

Job IRBR3029

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. C) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 21	Student Co					ncies				tructor	Course	Dont	TIMDO	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		-		Mean	
	General														
1 Did you gain new i	nsights,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
	make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43		4.29		4.23	4.25	4.43
	ions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5		4.33		4.23	3.97	4.27	4.37	4.33
_	ons reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	5		4.50		4.21	3.99		4.22	4.50
	ngs contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	7		4.55	. ,	4.38	3.81	4.04		4.55
	ments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	3	4		4.00		4.00		4.10	4.14	4.00
	stem clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5		4.48		4.27		4.16	4.21	4.48
8. How many times was		0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646	4.91		4.69	4.63	5.00
_	e the overall teaching effectiveness	-	0	0	0	0	8		4.20	754/1621			4.06		4.22
	Lecture														
1. Were the instructo	r'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
	seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	591/1572		4.51	4.70	4.73	4.82
	al presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80				4.28	4.27	4.53
	ontribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1559			4.29		4.73
	chniques enhance your understanding	12	5	0	0	1	0			****/1352					4.45
	Discussion														
1. Did class discussi	ons contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1384	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.99	****
	actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	3		****/1382	3.96	4.01	4.29	4.19	****
	encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	3		****/1368		3.99		4.21	****
4. Were special techn	_	16	3	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 948		3.64		3.89	****
	Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increa	se 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 mat	erials 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 instru	ctor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	42/ 209	4.73	4.50	4.35	4.64	4.82
	for lab reports clearly specified	4	12	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 555	4.78	4.17		4.33	****
	Seminar														
3. Did research proje	cts 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 experien	ce contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
_	derstand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
	available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
	ld you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	****	4.38	3.66	****
_	lp you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.59	****
	Freq	uency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum GDA Expected Grades				Re:	agons	2			Тул	ne.			Maiors	<u>.</u>

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				

? 1

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

			Fre	eauer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	-	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		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		3.99	4.30		4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	342/ 948		3.64			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	1.5	0	-	•	0	0	-	2 00		ate ate ate a	at at at a	4 26	4 05	also also also al
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	****

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

Credits E	arned	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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0104 University of Maryland Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 200

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A) Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om 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 th	ne instruc	tor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	300/1648	4.29	3.98	4.23	4.25	4.71
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	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 ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	12	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	440/1595	4.21	3.99	4.20	4.22	4.56
5. Did as	ssigned re	adings contrib	ute 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 wr	ritten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	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 th	ne grading	system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	1	2	2	6	10	4.05	1009/1623	4.27	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.05
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.91	4.82	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	198/1621	4.13	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.17
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	573/1568	4.37	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.28
	the instructor seem interested in the subjectlecture material presented and explained clear				4	0	0	0	0	1		4.94	,		4.51	4.70	4.73	4.33
	lecture material presented and explained clethe lectures contribute to what you learned				4	0	0	0	1	4		4.65	498/1564		4.06	4.28		4.18
	lecture material presented and explained cle				4	0	0	0	0	5		4.71			4.06	4.29	4.33	4.71
		-	7	9	0	1	2	1	1		****/1352		4.02	3.98	4.07	****		
		Discus																
1 Did al	ace diecu			what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/1384	3.78	3.91	4.08	3.99	****
				ed to participate	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1382		4.01	4.29	4.19	****
				nd open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1368		3.99	4.30	4.21	****
		chniques succe		d open discussion	19	1	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 948		3.64		3.89	****
		Labora	tory															
1 Did th	e lah inc		-	of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	18/ 221	4.72	4.36	4.16	4.45	4.92
				ground information	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	25/ 243		4.39	4.12		4.83
				for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	86/ 212		4.56	4.40		4.67
		structor provid			9	0	0	0	1	1	-	4.75	52/ 209		4.50	4.35	4.64	
		_		learly specified	8	9	0	0	1	0	3		****/ 555		4.17	4.29		****
J. WEIE I	equitemen	ics for tab lep	DI CB CI	rearry specified	0	,	U	U		U	3	1.50	/ 555	4.70	1.1/	1.27	1.33	
5 Did co	nferences	Field Field		field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 312	****	3 86	3 68	3 59	****
J. Dia co	JIII CI CIICCE	, neip you carr	y out i							_	Ü	1.00	/ 512		3.00	3.00	3.37	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	;	
00-27	2-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 4						quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	5
28-55																		
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	-major	16
84-150	4	D 0																
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					ŗh
				P 0		0.1					_	_	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	1T	
				; 0 I 0		Otl	her				1	7						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0104 University of Maryland

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quescionna	aires. 2	21		Student Cot	ILSE	Eval	uati	OII QU	lesci	OIIII	alle	:						
					Fre	equer	cies			Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om 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	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected 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	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	15	4.52	529/1375	4.23	3.97	4.27	4.37	4.52
		uations reflect			0	12	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	440/1595	4.21	3.99	4.20	4.22	4.56
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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
				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	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	2	2	6	10	4.05	1009/1623	4.27	4.00	4.16	4.21	4.05
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.91	4.82	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	4	7	0	3.64	1281/1621	4.13	3.86	4.06	4.01	4.17
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	uctor's lecture	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	e instruc	ctor seem inter	n the subject	14	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1521/1572	4.54	4.51	4.70	4.73	4.33	
			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	e lecture	es contribute t	you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1559	4.50	4.06	4.29	4.33	4.71	
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	our understanding	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	4.15	4.02	3.98	4.07	***	
				_														
l Did cla	ass disc	Discus		what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/1384	3 78	3.91	4.08	3.99	****
				ed to participate	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1382		4.01	4.29	4.19	****
				nd open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1368		3.99	4.30	4.21	***
		echniques succe		a open arboabbien	19	1	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 948					****
		Labora	torv															
1. Did the	e lab ind		-	of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	18/ 221	4.72	4.36	4.16	4.45	4.92
				ground information	9	0	0	0	0		10	4.83	25/ 243		4.39	4.12		4.83
				for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	86/ 212		4.56	4.40	4.62	4.67
		structor provid			9	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	52/ 209		4.50	4.35	4.64	4.75
				early specified	8	9	0	0	1	0	3		****/ 555		4.17			****
		Field	Work															
5. Did con	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.59	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ty	pe			Majors	\$
			0											- 				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 4		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	5	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	В 10				_				_							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4		Ge	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	-major	16	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0								•						,	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0								_	respons	es to k	oe sigr	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot)	her				1	.7						
				? 0														

Page 201

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION OMLAND, KEVIN E

Instructor: Enrollment: 246 Questionnaires: 101

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 202 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

University of Maryland

				Fre	-mie	ncie			Tnei	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	1	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course		0	0	1	3	19	34	44	1 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		1087/1649	4.16	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		0	0	4	5	23	40	29		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		1202/1595		3.99	4.20	4.21	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learn	ned	2	4	18	8	20	23	26		1341/1533			4.04	4.05	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you lea		1	48	1	8	12	18	13		1175/1512		3.83	4.10	4.11	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		3	0	1	6	16	22			849/1623		4.00	4.16	4.08	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled		2	0	0	1	0	40			1139/1646		4.82	4.69	4.67	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effective	eness	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 clear	rly	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		4.06	4.29	4.23	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand	ding	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 learn	ned	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 participa		48	0	1	4		17	24	4.11		4.11	4.01	4.29	4.37	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss		47	0	2	0	4	11	37	4.50			3.99		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 specifie	ed	96	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar			_	•			•	_				4 00		4 60	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced the		99	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		***	4.82	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attent		99	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		0.0	0	-	0	0	0	0	1 00	***** / 40	****	****	4 00	4 01	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criter:	ıa I	00	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	***	4.09	4.21	****
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learn	ned 1	00	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	00	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	00	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,	****	****	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	****
	Freque	ncy	Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected G	rades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	А	35	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	55
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	s there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	70	-			
				?	1						

MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI

Title CARUSO, STEVEN

Instructor: Enrollment: Questionnaires: 154

300

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 203 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	encie				tructor	Course	_			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
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			1187/1648			4.23	4.18	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	8	21	38	39			1169/1375		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			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			4.70	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	2		50		4.22			4.06	4.28		4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	2	4		12		88	4.34				4.29	4.23	
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		1333/1384		3.91	4.08	4.11	2.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	28	15	25	23			1302/1382		4.01	4.29	4.37	3.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	24	8	29	30			1252/1368		3.99		4.39	3.2
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		****/ 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	***
Freq	uency	7 Dis	trik	utic	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00_27 2 0 00_0 89 1 7 42			auir						Graduat		n	 Maio		

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Ą	Expecte	d 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	В	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	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	126				
				2	3						

Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI

Instructor:

Baltimore County BOLOGNESE, CYNT Fall 2008

Page 204 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 47 Questionnaires: 32

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3 4 5 3 4	0 0 0 0 5	0 1 1 0 3	0 2 2 2 2	2 3 1 7 8	9 7 4 8	16 13 16 11 6	4.30 4.00 3.39	670/1649 1065/1648 771/1375 1067/1595 1320/1533	4.02 3.95 3.72 3.07	4.16 3.98 3.97 3.99 3.81	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04	4.22 4.21 4.05	4.48 4.11 4.30 4.00 3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  Lecture	3 5 3 6	8 0 0 1	0 0 0	6 0 0	3 1 0 1	4 8 1 15	18 28	3.67 4.63 4.97 4.32	266/1646	4.36 4.95	3.83 4.00 4.82 3.86	4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.11 4.08 4.67 4.02	4.63 4.97
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3 4 4 5	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	2 0 3 4 2	3 4 9 3 5	25 16	4.76 4.86 4.46 4.61 4.52	586/1559	4.79 4.34 4.47	4.32 4.51 4.06 4.06 4.02	4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98	4.39 4.64 4.25 4.23 3.97	4.46 4.61
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4. Were special techniques successful	7 7 7 7	0 0 0 9	6 4 6 1	3 0 2 0	2 8 3 2	1 2	12 12	3.68 3.48	1122/1384 1137/1382 1186/1368 257/ 948	3.41 3.37	4.01 3.99	4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95	4.11 4.37 4.39 4.00	3.68 3.48
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified Seminar	25	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	****/ 555	***	4.17	4.29	4.22	***
<ol> <li>Were criteria for grading made clear</li> <li>Field Work</li> <li>Did conferences help you carry out field activities</li> </ol>	28	0	0	2	0	1 5			****/ 288 ****/ 312				3.58	****
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	***
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	iency	Dist	tribi		n asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 14 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 4			quire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor		1 1	Graduat Under-g		0	Majo	r major	14 18
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0			ectiv ner	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - : respons				_	h

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Questionnaires: 21

Enrollment:

24

Fall 2008

Page 205 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Frequencies			Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect				
Questions	NR	NΔ	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	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		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			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		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		4.71	137/ 948	4.38	3.64		4.00	4.71
4. Were special techniques successivi	13	_	U	U		U	U	4.71	137/ 540	1.50	3.01	3.95	4.00	4./1
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		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		****/ 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		****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 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		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	2	2		****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****
J. Did conferences help you carry out fretu activities	10	_	J	J	U	ٺ	4	1.50	/ 312		3.00	5.00	5.00	
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	****

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 21

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 205 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB Baltimore County

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 24

(Instr. B)

Fall 2008

Page 206 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	24			
Questionnaires:	21	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Frequencies			Tngi	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	I.evel	Sect				
Ouestions	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	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
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	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			3.98	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		3.64			4.71
1. Note apostal commiques successful	13	_	Ü	Ü	-	Ü	Ü	1.71	137, 310	1.30	3.01	3.75	1.00	1.71
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		,	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	2	2		****/ 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	4.32	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.16	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 24	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****
J. WELE CHELE EHOUGH PLOCEOUS TOL ALL THE STUDENTS	Τ0	U	U	U	U	U	3	5.00				3.77	±.05	•• ••

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 206 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0102 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB Balt Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A) F.

Enrollment: 21
Ouestionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 207

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 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 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 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  $8 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 2 \quad 11 \quad 4.85$ 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 1 0 4.00 ****/ 312 **** 3.86 3.68 3.60 **** Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0102 University of Maryland MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB Title

? 0

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 208

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

(Instr. B)

Instructor:

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 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 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 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  $11 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 5 \quad 4 \quad 4.30 \quad 632/1621 \quad 4.09 \quad 3.86 \quad 4.06 \quad 4.02 \quad 4.44 \quad 4.09 \quad 4.09$ 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 1 0 4.00 ****/ 312 **** 3.86 3.68 3.60 **** Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Credits Earned 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 5 2.00-2.99 2 C 2 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 00-27 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 7 General 0 Under-grad 21 Non-major 14 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 13

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0103 University of Maryland Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB Baltimore County

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB Baltimore County SANDOZ, JAMES W Fall 2008

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 209 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	484/1649	4.29	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.63
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	556/1648	4.15	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.50
		estions reflect			1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	546/1375	4.45	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.50
		ations reflect			1	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	746/1595	4.33	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.31
				what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	774/1533	3.73	3.81	4.04	4.05	4.07
	_	-		o 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	e grading	system clearly	v expla	ined	1	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	671/1623	3.95	4.00	4.16	4.08	4.38
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	1166/1646	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.53
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	252/1621	4.09	3.86	4.06	4.02	4.64
		Lecture	е															
		actor's lectures			3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50		4.15	4.32	4.43		4.50
		ctor seem intere			3	0	0	0	1	2	11		1003/1572	4.35	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.71
				explained clearly	3	0	2	0	0	4	8		1046/1564	3.97	4.06	4.28	4.25	4.14
		es contribute to			4	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	. ,	4.03	4.06	4.29	4.23	4.46
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	4	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	690/1352	3.84	4.02	3.98	3.97	4.00
	Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learn																	
	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	655/1384	4.61	3.91	4.08	4.11	4.29
	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				10	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	946/1382		4.01	4.29	4.37	4.00
		_		d 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 sp	pecial te	echniques succes	sstul		10	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	619/ 948	4.38	3.64	3.95	4.00	3.71
1 5'1 1		Laborat	_	5 . 1	1.0	0	0	0	0	•	4	F 00	**** / 001	4 26	4 26	4 16	4 05	****
		crease understar			13	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 221	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.07	****
				ground information	13	0	0	0	0	1 1	3		****/ 243	4.30	4.39	4.12	3.89	****
		materiais avai. structor provide		or lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 212	4.62	4.56	4.40	4.21	****
		_		early specified	13 13	0	0	0	0	1	4		****/ 209 ****/ 555	4.65 4.28	$4.50 \\ 4.17$	4.35	4.12 4.22	****
o. were re	equiremen	ics for tab repo	orts CI	earry specified	13	U	U	U	U	_	3	4.75	/ 555	4.20	4.17	4.29	4.22	
5. Did cor	nferences	Field Wighter Field South		ield activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****
							1		_				, -					
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	utioi	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	asons				Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А 6		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 8				_					_					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	Ι				0	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	-major	13
84-150	3.00-3.49 4 D 0																	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	n
				P 0							_	_	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	.5						
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Title Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 20

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 210 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	<b>.</b>	3.7.7		-	ncies		-		tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA 	1	2	3 	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	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		664/1646		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		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		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		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		****/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		****/ 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		****/ 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	****

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 210 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Expected Grades Re			Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-			
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

Fall 2008

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 211

Enrollment: Questionnaires:	24 20	Studen	Course Evaluation	on Questionnaire
			Fre	equencies

			Fre	equer	ncies	:		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	66/ 209	4.65	4.50	4.35		4.69
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	***

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Title Instructor: (Instr. B) Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 211 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 20

24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	16	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0105 University of Maryland Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 212 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	-															
		insights,skil			0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	871/1649	4.29	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.33
2. Did the	e instruct	or make clear	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	797/1648	4.15	3.98	4.23	4.18	4.33
		stions reflect			0	0	0	1	1	7		4.43	641/1375	4.45	3.97	4.27	4.22	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	2	1	6		4.33	722/1595	4.33	3.99	4.20	4.21	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned							0	0	4	6	5	4.07	774/1533	3.73	3.81	4.04	4.05	4.07
		_		what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	7		4.15	791/1512	4.19	3.83	4.10	4.11	4.15
		system clearly		ed	1	0	2	1	4	5			1241/1623	3.95	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.80
	-	as class cance			0	0	0	0	0	1		4.95	332/1646	4.80	4.82	4.69	4.67	4.95
9. How wou	ıld you gr	ade the overal	l teachi	ng effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	595/1621	4.09	3.86	4.06	4.02	4.08
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
		tor's lectures			0	0	0	0	3	7	11		1002/1568	4.15	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.04
		or seem intere		_	0	0	0	0	0	7	14		1071/1572	4.35	4.51	4.70	4.64	4.28
		-	-	lained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	7			1109/1564	3.97	4.06	4.28	4.25	4.02
		contribute to			0	0	1	1	1	7		4.24	980/1559	4.03	4.06	4.29	4.23	3.82
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance you	r understanding	0	2	1	1	5	8	4	3.68	960/1352	3.84	4.02	3.98	3.97	3.59
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contribu	ite to wh	at you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1384	4.61	3.91	4.08	4.11	****
				to participate	17	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/1382	4.40	4.01	4.29	4.37	****
		_	_	open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/1368	4.67	3.99	4.30	4.39	****
		hniques succes			17	1	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 948	4.38	3.64	3.95	4.00	***
		Laborat	oru															
1 Did +ba	lah inan	ease understar	_	the material	3	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	99/ 221	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.07	4.33
			_	ound information	3	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	155/ 243	4.30	4.39	4.12	3.89	4.00
				lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	_		4.50	105/ 212	4.62	4.56	4.40	4.21	4.50
		ructor provide			3	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	87/ 209	4.65	4.50	4.35	4.12	4.61
		s for lab repo			3	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	280/ 555	4.28	4.17	4.29	4.22	4.61
J. WEIG IC	.quii ciiiciic	s for lab repo	JICB CICO	ily specified	5	O	O	O	_	5	12	1.01	2007 333	1.20	1.17	1.27	1.22	1.01
F Warra 20		Seminar			20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/ 200	***	2 62	2 60	2 50	****
5. Were cr	riceria io	r grading made	e clear		20	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	****/ 288		3.63	3.08	3.58	
		Field V																
5. Did con	nferences	help you carry	out fie	ld activities	18	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Rea			sons	ons			Type			Majors		1	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99		A 11					or Ma			0	Graduat		0	мо		11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		Rec	1ulle	eu ro	o⊤ Mg	JOE	ь	U	Graduat	=	U	Majo	)T	TT
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 3		Ger	neral	ı				0	Under-g	rad 2	1	Non-	-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		JC1	-C- U	-					onaci 'g.		-	14011		-0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El-	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enona	rh
oraa.	Ü	3.30 1.00	-	P 0								•					_	
				I 0		Oth	ıer				1	7	responses to be significant					
? 3											_							

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0105 University of Maryland Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 21

(Instr. B)

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor

Page 213 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 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 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 4.157. 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 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 11 0 0 1 5 0 4 3.70 1418/1568 4.15 4.32 4.43 4.39 4.04 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 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 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 **** 17 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/1382 4.40 4.01 4.29 4.37 **** 0 0 1 3 4.75 ****/1368 4.67 3.99 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 17 0 0 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 4.504. 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 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 Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Majors Reasons ______ 00-27 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 в 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 3 56-83 2 General 0 Under-grad 21 Non-major 10 84-150 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 6 F 0 Electives 0 Grad. 3.50-4.00 4 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 17 3

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0106 University of Maryland
Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB Baltimore County

3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 0

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB Baltimore County SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 11

Ouestionnaires: 11

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 214

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

0 1 1 7 4.67 86/212 4.62 4.56 4.40 4.21 4.67

0 2 3 4 4.22 361/555 4.28 4.17 4.29 4.22 4.22

2 1 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 121/ 209 4.65 4.50 4.35 4.12 4.38

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 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 4.007. 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 4.00Lecture 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 0 0 2 4.00 946/1382 4.40 4.01 4.29 4.37 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1368 4.67 3.99 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 4. Were special techniques successful 8 2 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

#### Frequency Distribution

2 0 0

0

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ī
				P	0			responses to	nificant		
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0106 University of Maryland Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

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

Enrollment: 11 Ouestionnaires: 11

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 215

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 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 4.007. 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 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 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 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1368 4.67 3.99 4.30 4.39 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 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 3 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

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

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101 University of Maryland

Title CELL BIOLOGY Baltimore County CRAIG, NESSLY C (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Instructor:

Enrollment: 153 Questionnaires: 64

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 216

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Quescionnaires	01	Beddelle eoe	LIBC	Буат	uacı	.011 Ç	<i>z</i> ucb t	.10111	Iall	-						
					Fr	_	encie			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain n	new insights, skills fro	om 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 instru	actor make clear the e	xpected 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 o	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 eval	luations reflect the e	xpected 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 r	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 as	ssignments contribute	to what you learned	8	45	2	2	4	1	2	2.91	****/1512	****	3.83	4.10	4.11	****
	ng system clearly expl	ained	7		3		12	7	27	3.86	1210/1623	3.86	4.00	4.16	4.08	3.86
	s was class cancelled		7	0	0	0	0				133/1646				4.67	
9. How would you	grade the overall tea	ching 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 instr	ructor'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
	ctor seem interested		7	0	1	1	6	11			1265/1572		4.51	4.70	4.64	4.58
	aterial presented and		7	0	2	3	21				1356/1564		4.06		4.25	3.87
4. Did the lectur	res 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 audiovisua	al 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 disc	cussions contribute to	what you learned	52	0	8	1	0	2	1	1 92	****/1384	****	3 91	4.08	4.11	****
	ents actively encourage	_	52		7	1	0	0	4		****/1382			4.29	4.37	****
	actor encourage fair a		53		4	1	2	2	2		****/1368		3.99	4.30	4.39	****
	cechniques successful	na open dibeabbion	53	8	2	0	0	1	_		****/ 948			3.95		****
	-															
O Mana	Laboratory		63	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	++++/ 0/10	****	4 20	4 10	2 00	++++
	lded with adequate back ents for lab reports c		59	0 1	1	0	0 1	0	0		****/ 243 ****/ 555		4.39 4.17	4.12	3.89 4.22	****
J. Were requireme	encs for lab reports c	rearry specified	55			U	1	U	2	3.30	/ 555		T. I /	4.20	4.22	
	Seminar							_								
5. Were criteria	for grading made clear	r	60	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 288	****	3.63	3.68	3.58	****
	Field Work															
5. Did conference	es 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 end	ough proctors for all	the students	62	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	***
		Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trik	outio	n									
		_														
Credits Earned	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad						easor	1S			Ту 	pe 			Majors	S 
00-27 1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7		Re	quir	ed f	or M	Major	îs	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	35
28-55 1	1.00-1.99 0 2.00-2.99 7	B 18 C 15				_				_						
56-83 11		Ge	nera	ı⊥				1	Under-g	rad 6	4	Non-	-major	29		
84-150 8 Grad. 0	84-150 8 3.00-3.49 9 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 13 F 0					ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enous	7h
	9 3.30-4.00 13 F 0									_	respons				_	,
I 0					her				4	13			5-			

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101 University of Maryland Page 217
Title CELL BIOLOGY Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Title CELL BIOLOGY Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 153

Questionnaires: 64

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 7 0 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 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 Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Majors Reasons ______ 00-27 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 в 18 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 2.00-2.99 7 C 15 56-83 11 General 1 Under-grad 64 Non-major 29 84-150 8 3.00-3.49 9 D 1 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough Grad. 3.50-4.00 13 responses to be significant I 0 Other 43

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

					eaue	ncie	es		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
	General														
1. Did you gain	new insights,skills from this course	17	0	2	5	12	54	81	4.34	857/1649	4.34	4.16	4.28	4.27	4.34
2. Did the instr	uctor 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 eva	luations 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 a	ssignments 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 gradi	ng 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 time	s 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														
	ructor's lectures well prepared	47	0	0	0	7		101		480/1568	4.76	4.32	4.43	4.39	4.76
	uctor 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
	aterial 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
	res 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 audiovisu	al 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 alass dis	cussions contribute to what you learned	145	0	0	0	7	4	15	A 21	****/1384	****	3.91	4.08	4.11	****
	ents actively encouraged to participate	146	0	0	1	5	2	17		****/1382	****	4.01	4.29	4.37	****
	uctor encourage fair and open discussion	146	0	0	2	3	3	17		****/1368	****	3.99	4.30	4.39	****
	techniques successful	147	8	1	2	3	2	8		****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95	4.00	****
1. More Spectar	ocomingues successivi		Ü	_	_		_	Ü	3.00	, , , , ,		3.01	3.75	1.00	
	Laboratory														
1. Did the lab i	ncrease 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 prov	ided 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
	y 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 i	nstructor 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 requirem	ents 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														
_	topics relevant to the announced theme	167	0	0	1	1	1	1		****/ 88	****	4.82	4.54	4.63	****
	uctor available for individual attention	167	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.55	****
	projects contribute to what you learned	167	0	0	1	1	1	1		****/ 81	****	3.88	4.43	4.30	****
_	ions contribute to what you learned	167	0	0	1	2	0	1		****/ 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 orm		168	0	0	0	1	1	1	4 00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****
	erience contribute to what you learned ly understand your evaluation criteria	168	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****
	uctor available for consultation	168	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
		168	0	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****
	e could you discuss your evaluations es help you carry out field activities	154	0	0	6	0	10	1		****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.60	****
J. Did Conferenc	es herb you carry out fredu accivities	134	U	U	O	U	Τ0	Т	3.33	/ 312		3.00	3.00	3.00	
	Self Paced														
1. Did self-pace	d system contribute to what you learned	168	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
	stions make clear the expected goal	168	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
	tacts with the instructor helpful	168	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
_	ack/tutoring by proctors helpful	168	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
	ough 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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed 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	В	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	s there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	1	Other	101	-			
				?	4						

Course-Section: BIOL 304 0101

Title PLANT BIOLOGY Instructor: LU, HUA

Enrollment: 224 Questionnaires: 94

University of Maryland Page 219 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	).TD	377		_	ncie		-		tructor	Course	_		Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		4.32	4.43	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	3	25	59		1096/1572		4.51	4.70	4.64	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	3	20	31	31		1105/1564		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	,		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		****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	Major	59
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	33						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	15	General	1	Under-grad	92	Non-major	35
84-150	24	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	62				

? 5

Course-Section: BIOL 396 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title UGRAD TCHNG ASSISTANTS
Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

Page 220 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	Λ	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		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	****
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 411 0101 University of Maryland Title BACTERIAL PHYSIOLOGY

Baltimore County Instructor: SCHREIER, HAROL Fall 2008

Enrollment: 45 Ouestionnaires: 34

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 221 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 2 7 24 4.67 433/1649 4.67 4.16 4.28 4.50 4.67 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 5 8 20 4.45 629/1648 4.45 3.98 4.23 4.36 4.45 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 0 1 5 8 18 4.34 723/1375 4.34 3.97 4.27 4.48 4.34 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 13 0 0 5 4 11 4.30 759/1595 4.30 3.99 4.20 4.36 4.30 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 2 5 3 6 7 9 3.40 1317/1533 3.40 3.81 4.04 4.14 3.40 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 18 0 2 2 5 5 3.93 994/1512 3.93 3.83 4.10 4.26 3.93 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 1 0 1 3 6 22 4.53 469/1623 4.53 4.00 4.16 4.27 4.53 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 4 29 4.88 714/1646 4.88 4.82 4.69 4.71 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 1 0 0 0 10 16 4.62 279/1621 4.62 3.86 4.06 4.24 4.62 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 1 2 30 4.88 287/1568 4.88 4.32 4.43 4.54 4.88 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 3 29 4.85 740/1572 4.85 4.51 4.70 4.79 4.85 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 3 7 23 4.61 550/1564 4.61 4.06 4.28 4.40 4.61 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 0 5 27 4.76 390/1559 4.76 4.06 4.29 4.41 4.76 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 1 0 0 6 4 21 4.48 322/1352 4.48 4.02 3.98 4.07 4.48 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 27 0 2 3 1 0 1 2.29 ****/1384 **** 3.91 4.08 4.35 **** 25 0 2 1 1 3 3.11 1308/1382 3.11 4.01 4.29 4.56 3.11 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 26 0 02 1 1 4 3.88 ****/1368 **** 3.99 4.30 4.58 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 25 5 1 0 1 1 1 3.25 ****/ 948 **** 3.64 3.95 4.31 **** Laboratory 0 1 0 6 4.71 **** / 555 **** 4.17 4.29 4.41 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 27 Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 2 0 3 0 3.20 ****/ 288 **** 3.63 3.68 3.71 **** Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 28 0 0 1 0 5 0 3.67 ****/ 312 **** 3.86 3.68 3.95 **** Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	А	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	2	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7	-				-	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	10	Under-grad	32	Non-major	20
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0			_		_	
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0	FIECCIVES		responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-			
				2	^						

Course-Section: BIOL 414B 0101 University of Maryland Title EUKARYOTICS GENETICS Baltimore County Instructor: EISENMANN, DAVI Fall 2008

Enrollment:

21

University of Maryland Page 222
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 12	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
--------------------	-----------------------------------------

	Questions			NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean			Sect Mean	
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.50
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	464/1648	4.58	3.98	4.23	4.36	4.58
		estions reflec			0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	546/1375	4.50	3.97	4.27	4.48	4.50
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	321/1595	4.67	3.99	4.20	4.36	4.67
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute 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	e grading	g system clearly	y explai	ned	1	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	568/1623	4.45	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.45
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.82	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	595/1621	4.33	3.86	4.06	4.24	4.33
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well p	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	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested ir	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 le	cture mat	erial presente	d and ex	xplained 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	e lecture	es contribute t	o what y	ou learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	318/1559	4.80	4.06	4.29	4.41	4.80
5. Did au	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.50
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1384		3.91	4.08	4.35	5.00
		-	_	d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/1382	4.90	4.01	4.29	4.56	4.90
				d 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 s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	3.64	3.95	4.31	4.67
		Field																
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out fi	leld activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.95	****
				Freq	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	 A 3		Re	anir	ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		1	Majo		6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4		100	-1011	ca I	O1 1710	. , 0 1	~	•	STAGAGE	_	_	1100	-	J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2		Ge	nera	1				4	Under-q	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			a	_				-	011001 9		-	2.011		ŭ
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	_	2.22 2.30	-	P 0									respons				_	,
				I O		Ot!	her					6			5			
				? 1			-											

Course-Section: BIOL 426 0101

Title APPR TO MOLECULAR BIOL

Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C

Enrollment: 24

CRAIG, NESSLY C Fall 2008

Page 223 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

# Questionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General			_		_	_	_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	5	6		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		1630/1648	2.59		4.23	4.36	2.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0 5	0 1	3	4	6	1		1269/1375	3.29	3.97		4.48	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	U T	2	2	1 6	1		1566/1595	2.80	3.99 3.81	4.20	4.36	2.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		5	3	2	3	0	7		781/1533			4.04	4.14	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2 1	0	2	3	<i>3</i> 5	3	0		1498/1512 1517/1623	2.40	3.83	4.10 4.16	4.26 4.27	2.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	3 1		1391/1646		4.00	4.16		4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	6	11			1429/1621			4.09	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	Т	Т	О	О	1	3.33	1429/1021	3.33	3.80	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			1165/1572		4.51	4.70	4.79	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	10	3			1512/1564		4.06	4.28	4.40	2.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	7	4		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		****/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	1.0	0	^	0	^	0	1	F 00	**** / FFF		4 1 17	4 00	4 41	
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		****/ 288	****		3.68	3.71	****
or here driveria for grading made drear		_	Ü	-	Ü	Ū	Ū	2.00	, 200		3.03	3.00	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	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 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	****
_		- D.J	2 1											

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 430 0101 University of Maryland Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY Baltimore County Instructor: GLUICK, THOMAS Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Instructor

Frequencies

Page 224

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	41		
Questionnaires:	24	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	e

I

?

0

0

								c -1 acr		~		1110	01 00001	CCALDC	PCPC	CIDC		2200
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om 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 instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected 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 q	uestions reflec	t the e	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 eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected 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 r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1		2	0	4	10	6	3.82	1006/1533	3.82	3.81	4.04	4.14	3.82
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute t	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
		g system clearl		ained	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 cand	elled		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 overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	11	2	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	914/1621	4.00	3.86	4.06	4.24	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	e the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	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 ma	terial presente	d and e	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 lectur	es contribute t	o 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	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	2	2	1	0	1	9	9	4.25	515/1352	4.25	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc			what you learned	16	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1137/1384	3.38	3.91	4.08	4.35	3.38
				ed to participate	16	0	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	1216/1382	3.50	4.01	4.29	4.56	3.50
				nd 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	e special t	echniques succe	ssful	-	16	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.64	3.95	4.31	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	g			Ту	ne			Majors	:
			· 															
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 7		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 12				_				_	-		_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ge	nera	T				3	Under-g	rad 2	3	Non-	major	16
84-15		3.00-3.49	3	D 0		_									_			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ſh
				ь 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ıııcar	1T	

Other

12

Course-Section: BIOL 442 0101

BIOL 442 0101

Title DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY

Instructor: BREWSTER, RACHE (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 213
Questionnaires: 87

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 225 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				Fr	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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														
	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
	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		•		_	_							4 00	4 0=	****
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	71	0	3	1	5	3	4		****/1384	****	3.91	4.08	4.35	****
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	72	0	1	2	4	3	5		****/1382	****	4.01	4.29	4.56	
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	73	0	1	1	3	4	5		****/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	2 00	****/ 221	****	4.36	4.16	4.73	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 243	****	4.39	4.12	4.73	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	86 86	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 212	****	4.56	4.12	4.57	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	86	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 209	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	82	0	0	1	2	0	2		****/ 555	****	4.17	4.33	4.63	****
٥.	were requirements for lab reports creatly specified	02	U	U	_	2	U		3.00	/ 555		4.17	4.49	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	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.21	4.47	4.54	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	1	0	0	0		,	****	3.88	4.43	4.57	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.44	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	86	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 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	****
	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														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	86	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****
	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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d 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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	66	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 442 0101 University of Maryland Page 226
Title DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Title DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY Baltimore Count Instructor: EISENMANN, DAVI (Instr. B)Blumberg, Daphne Fall 2008

Enrollment: 213

Questionnaires: 87 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fr	eane	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	IIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General		_													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills		3	0	1	4	15	26	38		1076/1649	4.14	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the		3	0	0	7	23	31	23		1287/1648	3.83	3.98	4.23	4.36	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect th		4	0	1	11	24	28	19		1159/1375	3.64	3.97	4.27	4.48	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the		5	64	2	1	6	5	4		****/1595	****	3.99	4.20	4.36	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute	-	6	7	15	10	26	16	7		1481/1533	2.86	3.81	4.04	4.14	2.86
6. Did written assignments contribut	_	6	64	1	2	5	5	4		****/1512	****	3.83	4.10	4.26	****
7. Was the grading system clearly ex	plained	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 cancelle	d	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 t	eaching 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 we	11 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 intereste		12	0	3	5	7	20	40		1422/1572	4.49	4.51	4.70	4.79	4.49
3. Was lecture material presented an	_	12	0	10	11	22	16	16		1467/1564	3.82	4.06	4.28	4.40	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to wh		13	1	11	6	17	14	25		1373/1559	4.05	4.06	4.29	4.41	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance		13	11	6	6	16	12			986/1352			3.98	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhanc	e your understanding	13	ТТ	O	0	10	12	23	3.03	900/1352	4.01	4.02	3.90	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 encour	aged 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 successfu	1	74	6	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 948	***	3.64	3.95	4.31	****
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understandin		86	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 221	****	4.36	4.16	4.73	****
			0	0	0	1	0	0			****	4.39		4.61	****
2. Were you provided with adequate b		86	0	0	-	0	0	0			****		4.12		****
3. Were necessary materials availabl		86			1			-		****/ 212	****	4.56	4.40	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide as		86	0	0		0	0	0		,		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 w	hat you learned	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.15	4.35	4.44	****
5. Were criteria for grading made cl	ear	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	***	3.63	3.68	3.71	****
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute t		86	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your e	_	86	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for		86	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.52	****
										,	****	****			****
4. To what degree could you discuss		86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	, 55			4.38	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry ou	t freid activities	79	0	1	2	0	4	1	3.45	****/ 312	****	3.86	3.68	3.95	
Self Pace	d														
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 th	e expected goal	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****
3. Were your contacts with the instr	uctor helpful	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proc	tors helpful	86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for al		86	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****

Course-Section: BIOL 442 0101

DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY

Instructor: EISENMANN, DAVI (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 213

Title

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 226 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 87

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed 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	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	66	-			
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 444 0101 University of Maryland Title DEVELOPMENT AND CANCER

Ouestionnaires: 9

4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned

5. Were criteria for grading made clear

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 227 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.15 4.35 4.44 ****

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 288 **** 3.63 3.68 3.71 ****

Instructor: BIEBERICH, CHAR Fall 2008 Enrollment: 16

			Fre	eauei	ncies	\$		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	-	Mean	Mean
General			_		_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	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	_	4.86	175/1384	4.86	3.91	4.08	4.35	4.86
-	2	•	0	0	0	Τ	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.01	4.08		5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0		-	0	,		,				4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	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	Т	Τ	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	****

#### Frequency Distribution

8

8 0

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

University of Maryland Page 228
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: BIOL 451 0101

25

NEUROBIOLOGY

ROBINSON, PHYLL

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

								_	ncies	5	_		tructor		-		Level	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	762/1649	4.42	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.42
		ctor make clear			4	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1076/1648	4.08	3.98	4.23	4.36	4.08
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	4	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	875/1375	4.17	3.97	4.27	4.48	4.17
4. Did ot	her evalī	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	497/1595	4.50	3.99	4.20	4.36	4.50
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to 1	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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	o 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	e grading	g system clearly	y expla:	ined	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33		4.33	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.33
	-	was class cance			4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	597/1646	4.92	4.82	4.69	4.71	4.92
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	859/1621	4.10	3.86	4.06	4.24	4.10
		Lectur	_															
		actor's lecture			3	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1248/1568	4.08	4.32	4.43	4.54	4.08
		ctor seem inter		3	4	0	0	0	1	2	9		1071/1572		4.51	4.70	4.79	4.67
				xplained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.06	4.28	4.40	4.00
		es contribute to	-	•	4	0	0	0	2	4		4.33	,	4.33	4.06	4.29		4.33
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	3	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	650/1352	4.08	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.08
		Discus																
				what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	,			4.08	4.35	4.50
				d to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1382		4.01	4.29	4.56	4.50
				d open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/1368	****	3.99	4.30	4.58	****
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	342/ 948	4.25	3.64	3.95	4.31	4.25
		Labora	-															
5. Were r	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.17	4.29	4.41	****
				Frequ	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1			-			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1					ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	nt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: BIOL 451 0101
Title Neurobiology

Neurobiology tor: Lin, Weihong

Instructor: Lin, Enrollment: 0
Questionnaires: 16

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 14 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you	u gain ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	this course	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	954/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.27
		tor make clear	_	_	1	0	0	4	3	3	5		1448/1648	***	4.35	4.23	4.16	3.60
	_	estions reflec		_	2	0	2	1	1	5	5		1132/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	3.71
		ations reflect	_	_	1	0	1	2	1	6	5		1260/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	3.80
	_	-		hat you learned	2	0	1	2	2	3	6		1036/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	3.79
		_		what you learned	2	0	0 1	2 2	3 2	4	5 6		1055/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	3.86 3.79
		system clearl was class canc		Illed	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1252/1623 1/1646	****	4.22	4.16 4.69	4.08 4.67	5.00
	_			ning effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	8	0		1332/1621	****	4.05	4.06		3.54
		Lectur	_															
		ctor's lecture	_	_	2	0	0	0	3	3	8		1031/1568	***	4.50		4.39	4.36
		tor seem inter		_	2	0	0	0	1	2	11		1003/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	4.71
				plained clearly	2	0	0 1	4	4 5	3 1	3 4		1437/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	3.36 3.29
		s contribute t	_	ou learned our understanding	2	1	U T	3	2	7	4	3.29 4.15	1435/1559 590/1352		4.34	4.29	4.20	3.29 4.15
5. Did au	alovisual	. techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	۷	Τ	U	U	2	/	4	4.15	590/1352		3.91	3.98	3.80	4.15
		Discus																
				hat you learned	14	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	****
		_	_	l to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	****
		_		l open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	sstul		14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	****
5. Were r	equiremen	Labora its for lab rep	-	early specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	***	4.01	4.29	4.14	5.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad			15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.54	****
	_	Field						_										
5. Did co	nferences	help you carr	y out fi	eld activities	12	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	217/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	3.50
5. Were t	here enou	Self gh proctors fo		ne students	11	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	94/ 110	***	4.00	3.99	3.83	3.60
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 7					or Ma			 1	 Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		ĸe,	quir(	eu I	or Mg	וידטני	0	т	G1 dUudl	C	J	ria J	<i>)</i> <u>1</u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				3	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot!	her					3						
				? 0														

Baltimore County

Course-Section: BIOL 476 0101

ANTIBOTICS

20

LOVETT, PAUL S

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Page 229 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	a		Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5					Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept	UMBC Mean	Level	Sect Mean		
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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 th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	797/1648	4.33	3.98	4.23	4.36	4.33
3. Did th	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	0	1	5	9	4.53	521/1375	4.53	3.97	4.27	4.48	4.53
4. Did ot	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	2	4	8	4.43	608/1595	4.43	3.99	4.20	4.36	4.43
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	994/1623	4.07	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.07
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646		4.82	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	687/1621	4.25	3.86	4.06	4.24	4.25
		Lectur		_	1	0												
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	1	1	3	9		956/1568				4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	473/1572		4.51	4.70	4.79	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0		3	3	8	4.36	833/1564		4.06	4.28	4.40	4.36
		es contribute t		-	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	,	4.64		4.29		4.64
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	2	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	644/1352	4.08	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.08
1 544		Discus			0	0	0	0	1	_	1	4 00	705 /1204	4 00	2 01	4 00	4 25	4 00
				what you learned	8	0	0	0	Ţ	5	1		795/1384		3.91			4.00
				d to participate d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	5 5	4.71 4.71	,		4.01	4.29	4.56 4.58	4.71 4.71
		ctor encourage echniques succe		a open arscussion	0	6	0	0	0	0	5 1		****/ 948					
4. Wele s	рестат с	eciniiques succe	SSLUI		0	O	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 940		3.04	3.95	4.31	
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	 e	4	Majo	 r	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 5			-			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0													-	
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - Means there are not			enoug	ſh	
				P 0									respons	responses to be significant			it	
				I 0		Other						3						

? 0

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101 University of Maryland

EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES Baltimore Co

Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES
Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 230
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre 1	equen	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course							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						0	0	3	5	6	4.21	943/1648	4.21	3.98	4.23	4.36	4.21
			the expected goals		3	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	641/1375		3.97	4.27	4.48	4.43
			the expected goals		3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	417/1595		3.99	4.20	4.36	4.57
			te to what you learn		4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	342/1533		3.81	4.04	4.14	4.54
			bute to what you lea	rned	3	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	493/1512		3.83	4.10	4.26	4.43
		system clearly			3	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	608/1623		4.00	4.16	4.27	4.43
	-	vas class cance			4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	531/1646		4.82	4.69	4.71	4.92
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overal	l teaching effective	ness	3	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	159/1621	4.58	3.86	4.06	4.24	4.58
		Lecture	:															
1. Were t	the instruc	ctor'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
			sted in the subject		3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.51	4.70	4.79	5.00
			and explained clear	ly	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.06	4.28	4.40	4.71
4. Did th	ne 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 av	udiovisual	techniques enh	ance your understand	ing	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	286/1352	4.58	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.58
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							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						0	0	0	3	11	4.79	362/1382		4.01	4.29	4.56	4.79
			air and open discuss		3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	472/1368		3.99	4.30	4.58	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful						2	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	203/ 948			3.95		4.50
	-	-																
		Laborat			4			_	_	_								
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material						0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	29/ 221		4.36	4.16	4.73	4.77
_	2. Were you provided with adequate background information						0	0	0	3	10	4.77	33/ 243		4.39	4.12	4.61	4.77
			able for lab activit	ies	4	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	43/ 212		4.56	4.40	4.57	4.83
		ructor provide		,	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	87/ 209		4.50	4.35	4.63	4.62
5. Were r	requirement	s for lab repo	rts clearly specifie	a	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	252/ 555	4.75	4.17	4.29	4.41	4.75
		Seminar																
5. Were o	criteria fo	or grading made	clear	1	11	0	0	2	0	4	0	3.33	208/ 288	3.33	3.63	3.68	3.71	3.33
		Field W	ork															
5. Did co	onferences	help you carry	out field activitie	s 1	10	0	0	1	0	6	0	3.71	200/ 312	3.71	3.86	3.68	3.95	3.71
		Self P	aced															
5. Were t	here enoug		all the students	1	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.22	****
				<b>D</b>		D												
				Frequer	ıcy	ulst	_r1bu	ıtıor	1									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Gr	ades				Rea	sons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	1 A 4			Rec	 guire	ed fo	r Ma	ior	 s	2	 Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 or	5
28-55										J								-
56-83							neral	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	L5	Non-	-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0 D 0										3				_	
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4 F 0			Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h
			Р 0										responses to be significant					
			I 0		Other						8							
? 1																		

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES
Instructor: MENDELSON, TAMR (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 22 Ouestionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 231 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 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 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 4.437. 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 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 4.72/1368 4.71 3.99 4.30 4.58 4.714. 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  $\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 10 & 4.77 & 29/&221 & 4.77 & 4.36 & 4.16 & 4.77 & 2.88 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.61 & 4.77 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.61 & 4.77 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.61 & 4.77 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.61 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.61 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.61 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.61 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.61 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.61 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.61 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.19 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.79 & 4.39 & 4.7$ 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 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 15 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 110 **** **** 3.99 4.22 **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Majors ______ D 0 Under-grad 15 Non-major 12 84-150 4 F 0 Electives 0 Grad. #### - Means there are not enough

Other

P 0

I 0

2 1

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES Instructor: (Instr. C) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 232

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

						Eν	201101	naior	,		Tnat	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
	Questions				NA	Frequencie 1 2 3		3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	Mean
		General															
_	-	-	ls from this course	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	,		4.16	4.28	4.50	
	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals							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						0	0	4	9		641/1375	4.43	3.97	4.27	4.48	4.43
	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	1	4			417/1595			4.20		4.57
			te to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4			342/1533	4.54	3.81	4.04	4.14	4.54
			bute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2			493/1512		3.83	4.10	4.26	4.43
		system clearly		3	0	0	0	2	4 1			608/1623		4.00			4.43
	-	was class cance		4	0 1	0	1	1	4			531/1646		4.82	4.69		4.92
9. HOW WO	ouia you g	rade the overal	l teaching effectiveness	2	Τ.	U	T	1	4	8	4.30	571/1621	4.58	3.80	4.06	4.24	4.58
		Lecture															
1. Were t	3	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	767/1568	4.74	4.32	4.43	4.54	4.74			
2. Did th	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.51	4.70	4.79	5.00			
3. Was le	cture mat	erial 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 th	e lecture	s 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 au	diovisual	. techniques enh	ance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	240/1352	4.58	4.02	3.98	4.07	4.58
		Discuss	4														
1. Did cl	3	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	343/1384	4.64	3.91	4.08	4.35	4.64			
2. Were a	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	362/1382		4.01	4.29	4.56	4.79			
	3	0	0	0	1	2	11		472/1368	4.71	3.99	4.30		4.71			
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful						0	0	2	2	8	4.50	203/ 948				4.31	
	_	-															
Laboratory					0	0	0	0	2	1.0	4 55	00/001	4 88	1 26	4 16	4 50	4 88
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material						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						0	0	0	2	10 10		33/ 243	4.77	4.39	4.12	4.61	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance					1 0	0	0	1	3	9	4.83	43/ 212 87/ 209	4.83	4.56	4.40 4.35	4.57	4.83
			rts clearly specified	4 1	0	0	0	0		12				4.50 4.17	4.33	4.63	
J. WCIC I	.cquii ciiicii	ics for tab repo	res cicarry specifica	_	O	O	U	O	1	12	1.75	232/ 333	1.75	1.17	1.20	1.11	1.75
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria f	or 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 W	ork														
5. Did co	nferences		out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	6	0	3.71	200/ 312	3.71	3.86	3.68	3.95	3.71
			_														
E Works t	howo onou	Self P	aced all the students	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	****/ 110	****	****	2 00	1 22	****
o. were t	liere ellou	igh proctors for	all the students	15	U	U	U	U	2	U	4.00	"""/ 110			3.99	4.22	
			Freq	uency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	5
00-27 28-55	1 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	1 A 4 0 B 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	2	Majo	or	5
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 B 5		Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0 D 0		GGI	c. a.	-				_	onacı g.		- 5	14011		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
			P 0									respons					
			I 0		Otl	her					8	-					
			? 1														

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

Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)

Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B
Enrollment: 11

Ouestionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2008

Page 233 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 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 1 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 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 1 5 4.83 765/1572 4.62 4.51 4.70 4.83 4.623. 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 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 4 5.00 1/1352 5.00 4.02 3.98 4.10 5.00 Discussion 1/1384 5.00 3.91 4.08 4.30 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 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 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 4.9120/ 221 4.91 4.36 4.16 4.27 4.91 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 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 Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Credits Earned Required for Majors 0 Graduate 6 Major 0 General 1 Under-grad 5 Non-major 11 Ω #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other ? 2

Course-Section: BIOL 635L 0101
Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB University of Maryland FEB 11, 2009 Baltimore County

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 11 Ouestionnaires: 11

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 234

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 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 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 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 1/1384 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 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 1 5.00 ****/ 948 **** 3.64 3.95 4.03 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  $0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 10 \quad 4.91$ 20/ 221 4.91 4.36 4.16 4.27 4.91 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 0 0 0 0 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 Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Credits Earned Required for Majors 0 Graduate 6 Major 0 General 1 Under-grad 5 Non-major 11 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other ? 2

Course-Section: BIOL 700 0101

Title INTRO TO GRAD EXPERIEN

Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 11

CRONIN, THOMAS Fal

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 235 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

				Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions			NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	,	2	^	0	0	0	4	_	1 (1	471/1649	1 (1	1 10	4 00	1 10	1 (1
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	(	)	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.64 4.55	510/1648	4.64 4.55	4.16 3.98	4.28	4.46 4.34	4.64 4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		)	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	950/1375	4.00	3.90	4.23	4.44	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		)	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 learn		1	1	0	0	1	3 T	5	4.44	432/1533	4.44	3.81	4.04	4.28	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn		)	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		)	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	2	9	4.82	816/1646	4.82	4.82	4.69	4.81	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effective		4	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	789/1621	4.17	3.86	4.06	4.20	4.17
J. Now would you grade the overall teaching effective	.11000	1	_	U	_	U	2	J	1.1/	705/1021	1.1/	3.00	1.00	1.20	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 clear	·lv '	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				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				0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.02	3.98	4.10	4.50
	5									,					
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learn	ied (	)	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 participa	ite (	)	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 discuss	sion (	)	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	(	)	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 specifie	ed '	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 the		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 attent		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 learn		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	2	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	37/ 288	4.50	3.63	3.68	3.87	4.50
	Frequenc	су	Dist	ribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr	ades	Reasons							Тур	Majors					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	Graduate 2		10	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	0 #### - Means then		e are not enough		
				P	3			responses to				
				I	0	Other	4					
				?	0							