University of Maryland

Concepts Of Biology

Baltimore County Sokolove, Philli Fall 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 562

Questionnaires: 211

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 138 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	k	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	8	7	42	68	82	4.01	1114/1	509	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.18	4.01
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	7	22	51	65	60	3.73	1277/1	509	4.10	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	18	25	30	62	70	3.69	1113/1	287	3.99	4.08	4.30	4.24	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	55	13	12	47	40	37	3.51	1309/1	459	3.80	4.02	4.22	4.11	3.51
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	7	4	13	26	55	100	4.18	665/1	406	3.74	3.93	4.09	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	87	5	12	36	27	37	3.68	1101/1	384	3.75	3.98	4.11	3.98	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	11	25	59	47	62	3.61	1263/1	489	4.01	4.04	4.17	4.20	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	2	2	1	2	47	149	4.69	917/1	506	4.80	4.87	4.67	4.66	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	41	4	12	17	55	67	15	3.34	1314/1	463	3.72	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.34
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	13	29	44	116	4.27	1063/1	438	4.54	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	3	4	14	39	143	4.55	1123/1	421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.66	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	7	25	58	57	55	3.63	1245/1	411	4.09	4.21	4.31	4.27	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	15	17	49	42	80	3.76	1188/1	405	4.20	4.30	4.32	4.27	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	7	11	38	58	80	3.99	675/1	236	4.16	4.04	4.00	3.87	3.99
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	12	10	35	51	79	3.94	832/1	260	4.10	3.94	4.14	3.95	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	9	12	23	45	98	4.13	862/1	255	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.15	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	5	11	35	35	101	4.16	873/1	258	4.20	4.27	4.38	4.18	4.16
4. Were special techniques successful	24	10	8	16	31	42	80	3.96	479/	873	3.93	3.96	4.03	3.89	3.96
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	203	1	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	****/	184	****	4.45	4.16	4.06	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	204	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	****/	198	****	4.51	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	205	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/	184	****	4.55	4.48	4.48	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	205	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/	177	****	4.58	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	205	2	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/	165	****	4.31	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	205	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/	89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	205	2	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/	92	****	5.00	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	205	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/	90	****	5.00	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	205	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/	92	****	4.50	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	205	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/	93	****	4.50	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	205	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/	48	****	****	4.39	3.75	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	205	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/	48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	205	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/	47	****	****	4.51	4.53	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	205	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/	47	****	****	4.18	4.26	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	205	2	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/	44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	205	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/	49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	205	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/	41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	205	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/	46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	205	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/	37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	205	1	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/	30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Concepts Of Biology Sokolove, Philli

562 Questionnaires: 211

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 138 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons	3	Type		Majors	5
00-27	68	0.00-0.99	13	A	31	Required for Ma	 .jors 153	Graduate	0	Major	60
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	В	85						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	9	C	49	General	20	Under-grad	211	Non-major	151
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	14	D	7						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	2	Electives	3	#### - Means	s there	are not enoug	gh
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-	_		
				?	9						

University of Maryland

Title Concepts Of Biology

Instructor: Lake, Reagan A

Enrollment: 458
Questionnaires: 157

Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 139 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eane	ncie	S		Inst	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	2	0	2	5	21	36	91	4.35	789/1509	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.18	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	2	15	41	95	4.47	589/1509	4.10	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	7	19	48	80	4.28	755/1287	3.99	4.08	4.30	4.24	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	56	5	5	10	32	43	4.08	924/1459	3.80	4.02	4.22	4.11	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	51	15	14	19	27	23	3.30	1270/1406	3.74	3.93	4.09	4.02	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	106	3	3	10	12	17	3.82	1001/1384	3.75	3.98	4.11	3.98	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	2	1	3	20	34	90	4.41	583/1489	4.01	4.04	4.17	4.20	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	1	2	0	4	141	4.91	583/1506	4.80	4.87	4.67	4.66	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	32	3	3	3	18	52	46	4.11	799/1463	3.72	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	5	15	133	4.81	348/1438	4.54	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	4		130	4.79	811/1421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.66	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	14		105	4.55	568/1411	4.09		4.31	4.27	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	12		114	4.63	513/1405	4.20	4.30	4.32	4.27	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	8	2	18	26	94	4.32	431/1236	4.16	4.04	4.00	3.87	4.32
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	9	6	8	26	81	4.26	613/1260	4.10	3.94	4.14	3.95	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	1	11	14	28	76	4.28	762/1255	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.15	4.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	5	6	16	27	76	4.25	818/1258	4.20	4.27	4.38	4.18	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	28	31	4	7	25	20	42	3.91	536/ 873	3.93	3.96	4.03	3.89	3.91
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	144	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.06	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	152	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.51	4.22	4.14	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	152	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 184	****	4.55	4.48	4.48	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	152	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.58	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	152	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	147	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	150	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	150	2	0	1	0	0	4		****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	151	1	0	1	1	0	3		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	150	1	0	0	3	0	3		****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	3.92	***
Field Work	1.50	0	-	_	-	•	-	4 1 4		****	ale ale ale ale	4 20	2 55	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	150	0	1	0	1	0	5		****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	152	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 48 ****/ 47	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	153	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	, .,			4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	153	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	153	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	153	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	153	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	153	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	153	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	153	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Title Concepts Of Biology

Instructor: Lake, Reagan A

Enrollment: 458
Questionnaires: 157

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 139 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons	1	Type		Majors	5
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	2	А	40	Required for Ma	jors 111	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	В	57						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	27	General	7	Under-grad	157	Non-major	133
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	10	D	5						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	_j h
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				?	2						

Title Concepts Of Biol-Honor

Instructor: Craig, Nessly C

Enrollment: 19

aig,Nessly C Fall 2009

Page 140 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Overtiens	MD	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	1	_		tructor Rank	Course	_	-	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	. 			4		Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	4	2	6	2	1	2.60	1501/1509	2.60	4.34	4.31	4.18	2.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	4	6	2	0	2.47	1500/1509	2.47	4.09	4.26	4.25	2.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1287	****	4.08	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	5	2	0	5	0	2.42	1455/1459	2.42	4.02	4.22	4.11	2.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	4	3	2	2.87	1364/1406	2.87	3.93	4.09	4.02	2.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	4	5	1	0		1382/1384	2.21	3.98	4.11	3.98	2.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	4	8	0	0	0		1486/1489	1.67	4.04	4.17	4.20	1.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	14		408/1506	4.93	4.87	4.67	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	4	7	0	0	2.38	1450/1463	2.38	3.92	4.09	4.02	2.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	2	5	0	0	2.71	1423/1438	2.71	4.45	4.46	4.44	2.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1406/1421	3.29	4.69	4.73	4.66	3.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	2	5	0	0	2.71	1391/1411	2.71	4.21	4.31	4.27	2.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	0	3	0	0	1.86	1399/1405	1.86	4.30	4.32	4.27	1.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1236	****	4.04	4.00	3.87	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	1	7	1	0	2.13	1255/1260	2.13	3.94	4.14	3.95	2.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1005/1255	3.88	4.27	4.33	4.15	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	4	1	5	6		1049/1258	3.81	4.27	4.38	4.18	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	1	12	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	3.89	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.51	4.22	4.14	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.58	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.15	***
Frequ	.ency	Dist	ribu	utior	ı									

Credits Ea	ırned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors 12		Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	13
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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	_	-	
					-						

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Concepts Of Biology La

Fall 2009 Claassen,Lark A

Enrollment: 422 Questionnaires: 161

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 141 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	21	19	47	41	26	2 21	1455/1509	3.21	4.34	4.31	4.18	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	24	19	46	36	29		1445/1509	3.18	4.34	4.31	4.16	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	14	22	41	42	34		1190/1287	3.39	4.08	4.30	4.24	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	21	26	32	44	29		1392/1459	3.22	4.02	4.22	4.11	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	5	16	11	28	54	39		1140/1406	3.60	3.93	4.09	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	19	21	40	41	32		1277/1384	3.30	3.98	4.11	3.98	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	2	22	18	34	31	45		1345/1489	3.39	4.04	4.17	4.20	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	2	0	0	4	12	133	4.87	662/1506	4.87	4.87	4.67	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	37	3	22	24	55	15	5	2.64	1436/1463	2.64	3.92	4.09	4.02	2.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	6	8	34	46	46		1285/1438	3.84	4.45	4.46	4.44	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	10	14	22	50	43		1380/1421	3.73	4.69	4.73	4.66	3.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	15	18	38	44	22		1326/1411	3.29	4.21	4.31	4.27	3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	8	34	13	40	28	18		1371/1405	2.87	4.30	4.32	4.27	2.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	3	24	14	47	33	17	3.04	1126/1236	3.04	4.04	4.00	3.87	3.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	101	0	15	5	13	16	11		1155/1260	3.05	3.94	4.14	3.95	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	101	0	17	5	13	13	12		1210/1255	2.97	4.27	4.33	4.15	2.97
3 -	102	0	15	5	18	13	8		1238/1258	2.90	4.27	4.38	4.18	2.90
4. Were special techniques successful	104	22	4	2	17	6	6	3.23	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	3.89	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	66	2	4	4	22	25	38	3.96	120/ 184	3.96	4.45	4.16	4.06	3.96
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	66	0	5	6	10	35	39	4.02	121/ 198	4.02	4.51	4.22	4.14	4.02
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	66	1	3	1	11	19	60	4.40	124/ 184	4.40	4.55	4.48	4.48	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	66	2	6	3	12	19	53	4.18	126/ 177	4.18	4.58	4.36	4.29	4.18
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	66	2	7	14	18	24	30	3.60	139/ 165	3.60	4.31	4.18	4.15	3.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	146	3	0	3	3	3	3		****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	146	8	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	, -	****	5.00	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	146	7 6	1 2	2	4 2	1 2	0	2.63	****/ 90 ****/ 92	****	5.00 4.50	4.50	4.21 4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	146 146	6	1	3 4	2	1	1		****/ 93	****	4.50	4.38	3.92	****
5. Were criteria for grauting made crear	140	0		-1	2		1	2.07	/ 93		4.50	4.00	3.94	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	148	0	2	2	3	3	3	3.23		****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	148	0	2	3	4	1	3	3.00	,	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	148	5	1	0	3	2	2	3.30		****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	148	4	0	5	2	2	0	2.67	,	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	148	8	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	***	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	147	0	3	3	4	1	3	2.86	,	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	147	1	0	2	6	2	3	3.46	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	147	5	1	2	4	0	2	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	147	5	3	2	2	1	1	2.44	, -	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	147	5	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	***

Title Concepts Of Biology La

Instructor: Claassen, Lark A

Enrollment: 422 Questionnaires: 161 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 141 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	;
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	20	Required for Majors	94	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	0	В	39						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	5	С	35	General	11	Under-grad	161	Non-major	137
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	19	D	6						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	2	Electives	0	#### - Mean:	s there	are not enoug	rh
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_		_	
				?	4						

DII. BIOL 100 I

Title The Human Organism

Instructor: Lake,Re
Enrollment: 140

Questionnaires: 79

Lake, Reagan A Fall 2

Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 142 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	3	8	20	46	4.37	756/1509	4.37	4.34	4.31	4.18	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	18	51	4.48	574/1509	4.48	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	9	15	51	4.46	566/1287	4.46	4.08	4.30	4.24	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	33	2	1	9	7	27	4.22	814/1459	4.22	4.02	4.22	4.11	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	35	5	5	10	8	15		1166/1406	3.53	3.93	4.09	4.02	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	59	1	1	4	2	11		****/1384	****	3.98	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	10	15	51	4.51	458/1489	4.51	4.04	4.17	4.20	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	2	0	0	61	15		1340/1506	4.12	4.87	4.67	4.66	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	0	1	4	32	23	4.28	598/1463	4.28	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.28
Tashuus														
Lecture	2	0	0	1	2	0	C F	4.78	412/1420	4 70	4 4 5	4.46	4.44	4.78
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3 4	8	65 70	4.78	413/1438	4.78	4.45			
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	4	3 11	70 58	4.62	665/1421 482/1411	4.86 4.62	4.69 4.21	4.73 4.31	4.66 4.27	4.86 4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	9	62	4.62	459/1405	4.62	4.21	4.31	4.27	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	1	11	9	6∠ 51	4.00	373/1236	4.88	4.30	4.32	3.87	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	۷	۷	3	Т	TT	9	21	4.39	3/3/1230	4.39	4.04	4.00	3.07	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	5	2	7	6	23	3.93	832/1260	3.93	3.94	4.14	3.95	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	2	3	7	12	19	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.27	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	1	4	6	7	25	4.19	856/1258	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.18	4.19
4. Were special techniques successful	36	29	2	2	3	1	6		****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	3.89	****
i. Wele special teemingaes successial	50	2,	_	-	3	_	Ü	3.30	, 0,3		3.70	1.05	3.05	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	75	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	77	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.51	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.55	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.58	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	76	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	76	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	76	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	78	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	77	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	77	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
1. 10 mas asgree court for alboubb four evaluations	, ,	_	J	J	_	J	J	3.00	, 1,			1.10	1.20	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	77	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****

Title The Human Organism

Instructor: Lake, Reagan A

Enrollment: 140
Questionnaires: 79

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 142 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	5	 А	19	Required for Majors	15	 Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	24						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	22	General	43	Under-grad	78	Non-major	78
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				?	3						

100

Caruso,Steven M

Title

Instructor: Enrollment: University of Maryland

Life: Intro To Mod Bio

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 143 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	41	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	g		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	3	0	0	4	5	17	12	3.97	1144/1509	3.97	4.34	4.31	4.18	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	6	13	17	4.18	932/1509	4.18	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	4	4	14	17	4.13	869/1287	4.13	4.08	4.30	4.24	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	4	3	14	17	4.16	868/1459	4.16	4.02	4.22	4.11	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	11	2	1	7	7	8	3.72	1067/1406	3.72	3.93	4.09	4.02	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	3	1	9	11	11	3.74	1056/1384	3.74	3.98	4.11	3.98	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	2	8	8	19	4.19	833/1489	4.19	4.04	4.17	4.20	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	6	31	4.79	807/1506	4.79	4.87	4.67	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	0	5	13	8	4.00	853/1463	4.00	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	8	26	4.61	660/1438	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	6	29	4.78	846/1421	4.78	4.69	4.73	4.66	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	_	10	20	4.47	653/1411	4.47		4.31	4.27	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	13	19	4.40	758/1405	4.40	4.30	4.32	4.27	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	2	4	13	14	4.18	545/1236	4.18	4.04	4.00	3.87	4.18
or big dadiovibadi coomitaco cimanoc fodi anacibodharing		5	ŭ	_	-			1.10	313, 1230	1.10	1.01	1.00	3.07	1.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	2	6	5	7	3.71	958/1260	3.71	3.94	4.14	3.95	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	1	5	3	11	4.05	892/1255	4.05	4.27	4.33	4.15	4.05
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	873/1258	4.15	4.27	4.38	4.18	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	21	9	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	625/ 873	3.73	3.96	4.03	3.89	3.73
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	6	11	15	4.28	78/ 184	4.28	4.45	4.16	4.06	4.28
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	4	7	21	4.53	55/ 198	4.53	4.51	4.22	4.14	4.53
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	50/ 184	4.77	4.55	4.48	4.48	4.77
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	4	7	21	4.53	84/ 177	4.53	4.58	4.36	4.29	4.53
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	2	2	4	24	4.56	46/ 165	4.56	4.31	4.18	4.15	4.56
Coming to														
Seminar  1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2.0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	г оо	4 40	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38 38	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	5.00 5.00	4.49 4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.54	4.10	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	3.92	****
51 Hore 01100114 101 9144119 Hade 01041	50	ŭ	Ü	_	ŭ	_	Ü	3.33	, ,,		1.50	1.00	3.72	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	1	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	***

Title Life: Intro To Mod Bio

Instructor: Caruso, Steven M

Enrollment: 100
Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 143 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	 А	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	30	Under-grad	41	Non-major	41
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

15

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Ebiology - Phage Hunte Sandoz,James W (Instr. A) Title Instructor:

Fall 2009

Page 144 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnair	Questionnaires:	14	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------------------------------------------------	-----------------	----	---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	anier	ncies			Tnst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	351/1509	4.71	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1168/1287	3.50	4.08	4.30	4.35	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	931/1459	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.30	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	739/1406	4.10	3.93	4.09	4.09	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	767/1384	4.07	3.98	4.11	4.09	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	4	5		1184/1489	3.79	4.04	4.17	4.19	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1014/1506	4.57	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	489/1463		3.92		4.08	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	660/1438	4.55	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	483/1421	4.88	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	376/1411	4.66	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	605/1405	4.58	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	563/1236	4.19	4.04	4.00	4.11	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.94	4.14	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	690/1255	4.38	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	818/1258	4.25	4.27	4.38	4.44	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	25/ 184	4.79	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	36/ 198	4.71	4.51	4.22	4.51	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	45/ 184	4.79	4.55	4.48	4.62	4.79
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	39/ 177	4.79	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.79
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	64/ 165	4.43	4.31	4.18	4.56	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Ebiology - Phage Hunte Sandoz, James W (Instr. A) Title Instructor:

Enrollment:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 144 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

15 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland

Ebiology - Phage Hunte Baltimore County Caruso, Steven M (Instr. B) Fall 2009

Instructor: Caruso, Steven M (I

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 14

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 145 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	,	4.71	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	1	3	2		1168/1287	3.50	4.08	4.30	4.35	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	931/1459	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.30	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	739/1406	4.10	3.93	4.09	4.09	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	767/1384	4.07	3.98	4.11	4.09	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	4	5		1184/1489	3.79	4.04	4.17	4.19	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8		1014/1506	4.57	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	579/1463	4.34	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	588/1438	4.55	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	537/1421	4.88	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	416/1411	4.66	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	558/1405	4.58	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	248/1236	4.19	4.04	4.00	4.11	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.94	4.14	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	690/1255	4.38	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	818/1258	4.25	4.27	4.38	4.44	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	25/ 184	4.79	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	36/ 198	4.71	4.51	4.22	4.51	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	45/ 184	4.79	4.55	4.48	4.62	4.79
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	39/ 177	4.79	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.79
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	64/ 165	4.43	4.31	4.18	4.56	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Ebiology - Phage Hunte

Title Instructor: Caruso, Steven M (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 145 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Ebiology - Phage Hunte

Title (Instr. C)

Instructor:

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 14 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 146 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	351/1509	4.71	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	1	3	2		1168/1287	3.50	4.08	4.30	4.35	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	931/1459	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.30	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	739/1406	4.10	3.93	4.09	4.09	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	767/1384	4.07	3.98	4.11	4.09	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	1184/1489	3.79	4.04	4.17	4.19	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1014/1506	4.57	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	545/1463	4.34	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	960/1438	4.55	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	794/1421	4.88	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	469/1411	4.66	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	513/1405	4.58	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	799/1236	4.19	4.04	4.00	4.11	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.94	4.14	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	690/1255	4.38	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	818/1258	4.25	4.27	4.38	4.44	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	25/ 184	4.79	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	36/ 198	4.71	4.51	4.22	4.51	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	45/ 184	4.79	4.55	4.48	4.62	4.79
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	39/ 177	4.79	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.79
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	64/ 165	4.43	4.31	4.18	4.56	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46	****	****	4.14	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.31	****	****
4. Was the reedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	/ 30			4.2/		

Course-Section: BIOL 215H 1 University of Maryland Ebiology - Phage Hunte Title

Baltimore County (Instr. C) Fall 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 146

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 1 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab
Instructor: Fleischmann, Est (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 21

Fall 2009

Page 147 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	15		374/1509	4.72	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	483/1509	4.48	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	2	12	4.26	771/1287		4.08	4.30	4.35	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	4	1	6		1077/1459	4.25	4.02	4.22	4.30	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	4	11		478/1406	4.36	3.93	4.09	4.09	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	619/1384	4.11	3.98	4.11	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	5	_	10	4.05	951/1489	4.24	4.04	4.17	4.19	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1			350/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	0	5	1	2	3.33	1314/1463	3.95	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	4	1	5	3 91	1268/1438	4.33	4.45	4.46	4.48	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	2	1	7		1285/1421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	3	5	3		1051/1411	4.48		4.31	4.37	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	3	5		1005/1405		4.30	4.32	4.39	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	0	0	0	1	3		****/1236	4.49	4.04	4.00	4.11	****
									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	964/1260	3.82	3.94	4.14	4.19	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	822/1255	4.12	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	792/1258	4.13	4.27	4.38	4.44	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	****
T - D														
Laboratory	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	4 60	40 / 104	4 52	4 4 5	1 10	4 54	1 60
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	3 4	9	4.62	42/ 184	4.53	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.62
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8 8	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	55/ 198	4.60	4.51	4.22	4.51 4.62	4.54
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	2	10 10	4.69	68/ 184 32/ 177		4.55	4.48 4.36	4.62	4.69 4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	8	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 165	4.81	4.58 4.31	4.36	4.55	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	U	U	U	1	3	4.75	/ 105	4.00	4.31	4.10	4.50	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.00	****
=: 11 ··· 1														
Field Work	0.0	0	•	•	0	0	-	F 00		also also also also	ale ale ale ale	4 10	4 56	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	* * * *	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Frequency	Distribution	

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected (	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	2	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 5	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 8	8	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D (	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F (	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n

I

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 1 University of Maryland Page 148 MAR 22, 2010 Title

Anatomy & Physiol Lab Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. B) Fall 2009

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 21

Grad.

3.50-4.00 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Quescionn	all Cb.	21	Student Cot	II SC	Evar	uaci	J11 Q1	uest.	LOIII	iaire	•						
		Questions		MR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 5 1		General		-	•	0	0	-		1 =	4 50	254/1500	4 50	4 2 4	4 21	4 24	4 50
_	_		ls from this course the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	15 12	4.70 4.55			4.34	4.31	4.34	4.70 4.55
			the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	2	12	4.26	,		4.09	4.20	4.35	4.35
			the expected goals	1	8	1	0	4	1			1077/1459			4.22	4.30	3.92
			te to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	4			478/1406		3.93	4.09	4.09	4.37
			oute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	2	2		4.25			3.98	4.11	4.09	4.25
		g system clearly		2	0	0	2	5	2			951/1489		4.04		4.19	4.05
		was class cancel		1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	350/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.95
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overall	l teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1125/1463	3.95	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.56
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	well prepared	15	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1288/1438	4.33	4.45	4.46	4.48	3.87
			sted in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	3	4		1107/1421		4.69	4.73	4.76	4.42
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	810/1411	4.48	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.17
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute to	what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	828/1405	4.61	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.21
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enha	ance your understanding	15	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1236	4.49	4.04	4.00	4.11	****
		Discussi	ion														
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribut	te to what you learned	11	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	964/1260	3.82	3.94	4.14	4.19	3.70
			ouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20			4.27	4.33	4.37	4.20
			air and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	- ,		4.27	4.38	4.44	4.30
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques success	sful	11	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	****
		Laborato	=														
			ding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62			4.45	4.16	4.54	4.62
			e background information	8	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54					4.51	
			able for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1			4.69			4.55		4.62	
		structor provide	assistance cts clearly specified	9	0 8	0	0	0	1	10 3	4.83				4.36	4.65	4.83
5. were r	equireme	nts for lab repor	rts clearly specified	9	8	U	U	U	1	3	4./5	****/ 165	4.88	4.31	4.18	4.56	
1		Seminar		0.0	0	0	0	0	0	-	F 00	****	de de de de	F 00	4 40	F 00	de de de de
			to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 89		5.00	4.49	5.00	****
			te to what you learned	20 20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90 ****/ 92		5.00	4.50		****
4. Dia pr	esentati	ons contribute to	o what you learned	20	Ü	U	U	U	0	1	5.00	^^^^/ 92	^^^	4.50	4.38	4.00	****
		Field Wo								_							
			ss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47 ****/ 44	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Dia co	nierence	s neip you carry	out field activities	20	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 44	^^^	* * * * *	4.32	4.67	****
		Self Pa			_	_	_	-	_	_							
_		acts with the ins	_	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46		****	4.31	4.00	****
		ck/tutoring by pr		20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37 ****/ 30		****	4.05	****	****
o. were t	mere eno	ugii proctors for	all the students	20	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 30			4.27		
			Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 A 2		 Red	าแรก	 ed f	or Ma		 -g 1	 8	 Graduat			 Majo	 nr	 3
28-55					1/6/	4 0 T L	Lu I	OT MC	בט כ ג	. D I	. 0	Graduat	_	U	Ma JC	<i>)</i> <u> </u>	ی
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 8				Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	-major	18	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2 D 0		001	c_u.	_				_	011401 9	_ ~ ~ _ 2	-	1,011		
~ 1	_	3.00 3.19	2 5 0								0	0.0.0.0		,			,

Electives

0

#### - Means there are not enough

I

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 1 University of Maryland Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 149 MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 22 Ouestionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

(Instr. C)

Instructor:

3

2

2

28-55

56-83

84-150

Grad.

1.00-1.99

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

2

3

В 5

8

0

C

D

Questionnaires: 21 Student Cou	ırse	Eval	uati	on Q	uesti	onn	aire	:						
			Fr	eque	ncies	5		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	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	374/1509	4.72	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	483/1509	4.48	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	2	12	4.26	771/1287	4.33	4.08	4.30	4.35	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1077/1459		4.02	4.22	4.30	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	4		4.37			3.93	4.09	4.09	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	2	2		4.25			3.98	4.11	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	5			4.05			4.04	4.17	4.19	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.95			4.87	4.67	4.61	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1194/1463	3.95	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.56
Lecture				_	_		_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	1	1	2	1		****/1438		4.45	4.46	4.48	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	2	3		****/1421		4.69	4.73	4.76	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0 1	3 1	2		****/1411		4.21	4.31	4.37	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16 16	2	0	0	2	0	1		****/1405 ****/1236		4.30	4.32	4.39 4.11	4.21
_, ,														
Discussion	11	0	1	0	4	1	4	2 70	064/1060	2 00	2 04	1 11	4 10	2 77
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11 11	0	1	0	4	1 2	4 5	3.70 4.20	964/1260 822/1255		3.94 4.27	4.14	4.19 4.37	3.70 4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	1	5 6	4.20			4.27	4.38	4.44	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	2	0	3		****/ 873		3.96	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	42/ 184	4.53	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.62
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54			4.51	4.22	4.51	4.54
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	2		4.69	68/ 184		4.55	4.48	4.62	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	32/ 177		4.58	4.36	4.65	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 165	4.88	4.31	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.00	****
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37		****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****
Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2							 1	0			0	Mo -		
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		ке	quir	eu I	or Ma	Jor	.s 1	.0	Graduat	E	U	Majo	Σ.	3

General

Electives

0

0

Under-grad 21

#### - Means there are not enough

Non-major 18

I

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 2 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab
Instructor: Fleischmann, Est (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 150 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

~							_	~				<b>-</b> .		~			- 1	<b>a</b> .
		Ouestion	ıs		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		_		Level Mean	
																		·
		Genera	ıl															
		ew insights,ski			2	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68			4.34	4.31	4.34	4.68
		ctor make clear			2	0	1	0	1	7	13	4.41	,		4.09	4.26	4.32	4.41
		uestions reflec			2	0	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	-,		4.08	4.30	4.35	4.32
		uations reflect			3	10	1	0	0	2	8	4.45			4.02	4.22	4.30	4.45
	-	_		what you learned	3	1	1	0	4	4	11	4.20			3.93	4.09	4.09	4.20
		_		o what you learned	3	11	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	1017/1384	4.11	3.98	4.11	4.09	3.80
		g system clearl		ined	3	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	,		4.04	4.17	4.19	4.14
		was class cand			3	0	0	0	0	2	19		583/1506		4.87	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	11	0	0	1	2	9	1	3.77	1092/1463	3.95	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.28
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	15	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.61
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	16	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	881/1421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	303/1411	4.48	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.71
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	513/1405	4.61	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.83
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	16	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	563/1236	4.49	4.04	4.00	4.11	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1260	3.82	3.94	4.14	4.19	****
				ed to participate	19	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1255	4.12	4.27	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1258	4.13	4.27	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	essful		19	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	***
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab in	crease understa	nding o	of the material	6	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	90/ 184	4.53	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.22
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequa	ite back	ground information	6	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	59/ 198	4.60	4.51	4.22	4.51	4.50
3. Were n	necessary	materials avai	lable f	for lab activities	6	0	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	146/ 184	4.52	4.55	4.48	4.62	4.22
4. Did th	ne lab in	structor provid	le assis	stance	6	0	0	2	2	2	12	4.33	110/ 177	4.61	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.33
5. Were r	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	6	15	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 165	4.88	4.31	4.18	4.56	****
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7				Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	 s 2	0	 Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 or	 4		
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0 B 10								J						5		
28-55 7 1.00-1.99 0 B 10				<b>a</b> -		7				^	TT			37		0.0		

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	Expected Grades Reasons					Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 2 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

Anatomy & Physiol Lab

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2009

Page 151

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	386/1509	4.72	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	7	13	4.41	699/1509	4.48	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	728/1287	4.33	4.08	4.30	4.35	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	10	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	536/1459	4.25	4.02	4.22	4.30	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	656/1406	4.36	3.93	4.09	4.09	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	11	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	1017/1384	4.11	3.98	4.11	4.09	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	875/1489	4.24	4.04	4.17	4.19	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	583/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	263/1463	3.95	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	447/1438	4.33	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421		4.69	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	303/1411	4.48	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1405	4.61	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	176/1236	4.49	4.04	4.00	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1260	3.82	3.94	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1255	4.12	4.27	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1258	4.13	4.27	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	***	3.96	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	90/ 184	4.53	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	59/ 198	4.60	4.51	4.22	4.51	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	146/ 184	4.52	4.55	4.48	4.62	4.22
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	2	2	2	12	4.33	110/ 177	4.61	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	15	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 165	4.88	4.31	4.18	4.56	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 2 University of Maryland

Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. C) Fall 2009

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 152

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	386/1509	4.72	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	7	13	4.41	699/1509		4.09	4.26	4.32	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	728/1287	4.33	4.08	4.30	4.35	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	10	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	536/1459	4.25	4.02	4.22	4.30	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	656/1406	4.36	3.93	4.09	4.09	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	11	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	1017/1384	4.11	3.98	4.11	4.09	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	875/1489	4.24	4.04	4.17	4.19	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	583/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	325/1463	3.95	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	447/1438	4.33	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	469/1411	4.48	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	205/1415		4.30	4.32	4.39	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	176/1236			4.00		4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	2	1		****/1260		3.94	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	2	2		****/1255		4.27	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	1	3		****/1258		4.27	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	90/ 184	4.53	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	59/ 198		4.51	4.22	4.51	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	146/ 184		4.55	4.48	4.62	4.22
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	2	2	2	12	4.33	110/ 177	4.61	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	15	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 165	4.88	4.31	4.18	4.56	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland

Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab Instructor: Fleischmann, Est (Instr. A)

Instructor: Flei Enrollment: 26 Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 153 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	26		
Questionnaires:	22	Student Course Evaluation Question	naire

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
a 1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	244/1509	4.72	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	589/1509	4.72	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7		4.45	590/1287	4.33	4.08	4.30	4.35	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	3	3		4.44	569/1459	4.25	4.02	4.22	4.30	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	6		4.57	287/1406	4.36		4.09	4.09	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	466/1384	4.11	3.98	4.11	4.09	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4		4.67	276/1489	4.24	4.04	4.17	4.19	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	682/1506	4.91	4.87		4.61	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	9	9	4.32	567/1463			4.09	4.08	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	291/1438	4.33	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	322/1421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	496/1411	4.48	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	419/1405	4.61	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	314/1236	4.49	4.04	4.00	4.11	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	746/1260	3.82	3.94	4.14	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	904/1255	4.12	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	1025/1258	4.13	4.27	4.38	4.44	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 873	***	3.96	4.03	4.04	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	20/ 184	4.53	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	24/ 198	4.60	4.51	4.22	4.51	4.85
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	68/ 184	4.52	4.55	4.48	4.62	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	59/ 177	4.61	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	5	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	17/ 165	4.88	4.31	4.18	4.56	4.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Anatomy & Physiol Lab

Instructor: Fleischmann, Est (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 26 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 153 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 22

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	18	 Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				2	0						

26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab

Instructor:

Enrollment:

(Instr. B)

Page 154 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	22	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	milar	ncies			Inat	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Lezzel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΑ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«»«»»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	244/1509	4.72	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	589/1509	4.48	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	590/1287	4.33	4.08	4.30	4.35	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	569/1459	4.25	4.02	4.22	4.30	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	287/1406	4.36	3.93	4.09	4.09	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	466/1384	4.11	3.98	4.11	4.09	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	276/1489	4.24	4.04	4.17	4.19	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	682/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1133/1463	3.95	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	1282/1438	4.33	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1322/1421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	858/1411	4.48	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	2		4.67	459/1405	4.61	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1236	4.49	4.04	4.00	4.11	4.45
Discussion	1.4	0	-	•	0	_	_	4 00	E46/1060	2 00	2 04	4 1 4	4 10	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	746/1260	3.82	3.94	4.14	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	904/1255	4.12	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	1	0	5		1025/1258	4.13	4.27	4.38	4.44	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	20/ 184	4.53	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	24/ 198	4.60	4.51	4.22	4.51	4.85
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	_		4.69	68/ 184	4.52	4.55	4.48	4.62	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	59/ 177	4.61	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	5	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	17/ 165	4.88	4.31	4.18	4.56	4.88
o. Here requirements for tax reports Creating specified		5	Ü	ŭ	Ü	_	•	1.00	1,, 103	1.00	1.01	1110	1.50	1.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	****	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.20	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****
J. Hold chiefe chough proceeds for all the beautiful	20	0	J	J	_	J	_	1.00	, 30			1.47		

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 4 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 22

Page 154 MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	С	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 1 University of Maryland
Title Ecology & Evolution Baltimore County

Instructor: Omland, Kevin E (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 231
Ouestionnaires: 91

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Fall 2009

Page 155 MAR 22, 2010

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 2 0 1 1 0 32 45 4.34 800/1509 4.34 4.34 4.31 4.32 4.34 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 0 2 10 43 33 4.22 901/1509 4.22 4.09 4.26 4.25 4.22 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 0 5 12 35 37 4.17 844/1287 4.17 4.08 4.30 4.33 4.17 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 38 2 1 9 19 20 4.06 945/1459 4.06 4.02 4.22 4.26 4.06 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 5 8 13 17 19 23 3.45 1207/1406 3.45 3.93 4.09 4.12 3.45 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 48 2 4 8 12 11 3.70 1083/1384 3.70 3.98 4.11 4.15 3.70 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 6 0 0 2 9 28 46 4.39 619/1489 4.39 4.04 4.17 4.14 4.39 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 1 0 0 0 2 83 4.98 175/1506 4.98 4.87 4.67 4.67 4.98 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 1 0 3 25 32 14 3.77 1084/1463 3.91 3.92 4.09 4.08 3.91 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 6 0 1 4 7 25 48 4.35 981/1438 4.61 4.45 4.46 4.43 4.61 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 0 0 0 2 83 4.98 161/1421 4.88 4.69 4.73 4.73 4.88 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 1 6 7 35 35 4.15 964/1411 4.40 4.21 4.31 4.29 4.40 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 0 1 4 4 18 58 4.51 634/1405 4.57 4.30 4.32 4.32 4.57 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 5 6 2 16 21 37 3.99 686/1236 4.35 4.04 4.00 4.07 4.35 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 62 0 0 2 8 4 15 4.10 712/1260 4.10 3.94 4.14 4.22 4.10 2 5 7 14 4.07 886/1255 4.07 4.27 4.33 4.37 4.07 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 62 0 1 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 63 0 0 1 2 6 19 4.54 598/1258 4.54 4.27 4.38 4.42 4.54 4. Were special techniques successful 63 10 1 2 7 5 3 3.39 ****/ 873 **** 3.96 4.03 4.08 ****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 А	29	Required for Majors	55	Graduate	0	Major	49
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	29						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	4	Under-grad	91	Non-major	42
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	1	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 1 University of Maryland Title Ecology & Evolution

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Mendelson, Tamra (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 231 Questionnaires: 91

Page 156 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
G1														
General	_	0	1	1	10	20	4 -	1 21	000/1500	1 21	4 2 4	4 21	4 20	1 2 1
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	U T	7	10 10	32 43	45 33	4.34	800/1509 901/1509	4.34	4.34	4.31	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0		12	35	33 37	4.22	844/1287	4.22	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.22 4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	38	2	1	9	35 19	20	4.17	- , -	4.17	4.08	4.30	4.33	4.17
· · ·	6	38 5	2 8	13	9 17	19	23		1207/1406		3.93		4.26	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		5 48	•								3.93	4.09		3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6 6	48	2	4	8 9	12 28	11 46	4.39	1083/1384 619/1489	3.70 4.39	3.98 4.04	4.11 4.17		4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		1	0	0	0		83	4.39	175/1506		4.04	4.17	4.14 4.67	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	5 20	1	0	1	13	2 38	18	4.98	-,		3.92	4.67		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	U	1	13	38	18	4.04	831/1463	3.91	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	5	11	61	4.73	497/1438	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	1	0	12	63	4.80	794/1421	4.88	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	1	5	19	51	4.58	- ,	4.40	4.21	4.31	4.29	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	2	21	52	4.58	,		4.30	4.32	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	1	0	1	5	20	51	4.57	229/1236				4.07	4.35
10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.000 10.									.,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	2	8	4	15	4.10	712/1260	4.10	3.94	4.14	4.22	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	62	0	1	2	5	7	14	4.07	886/1255	4.07	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	63	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	598/1258	4.54	4.27	4.38	4.42	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	63	10	1	2	7	5	3	3.39	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.08	****
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	А	29	Required for Majors	55	Graduate	0	Major	49
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	29						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	5	C	9	General	4	Under-grad	91	Non-major	42
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	1	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 1 Univ

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Title Ecology & Evolution
Instructor: Leips, Jeffery W (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 231
Questionnaires: 91

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 157 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
2. Did the instr 3. Did the exam 4. Did other eva 5. Did assigned 6. Did written a 7. Was the gradi 8. How many time	General new insights, skills nuctor make clear the questions reflect the cluations reflect the readings contribute assignments contribute assignments clearly exp as was class cancelled grade the overall to	expected goals expected goals expected goals to what you lear to what you leplained	ned arned	2 3 2 6 6 6 5 20	0 0 0 38 5 48 0 1	1 0 0 2 8 2 0 0	1 2 5 1 13 4 2 0	10 10 12 9 17 8 9 0	32 43 35 19 19 12 28 2	45 33 37 20 23 11 46 83	3.70 4.39 4.98	800/1509 901/1509 844/1287 945/1459 1207/1406 1083/1384 619/1489 175/1506 970/1463	4.34 4.22 4.17 4.06 3.45 3.70 4.39 4.98 3.91	4.34 4.09 4.08 4.02 3.93 3.98 4.04 4.87 3.92	4.31 4.26 4.30 4.22 4.09 4.11 4.17 4.67 4.09	4.32 4.25 4.33 4.26 4.12 4.15 4.14 4.67 4.08	4.34 4.22 4.17 4.06 3.45 3.70 4.39 4.98 3.91
Lecture  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  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						0 0 0 2 0 0	0 0 1 0 3	2 2 6 2 3 8 5 2 7	16 6 25 16 23 4 7 6 5	58 67 43 56 45 15 14 19 3	4.74 4.87 4.47 4.63 4.49 4.10 4.07 4.54 3.39	639/1421 665/1411 499/1405 290/1236	4.61 4.88 4.40 4.57 4.35 4.10 4.07 4.54 ****	4.69 4.21 4.30 4.04	4.46 4.73 4.31 4.32 4.00 4.14 4.33 4.38 4.03	4.43 4.73 4.29 4.32 4.07 4.22 4.37 4.42 4.08	4.88 4.40 4.57 4.35
			Frequ	ionai	. Dia	+ v i h	t i o	n									
Credits Earned								ason	s			Тур	oe .			Majors	;
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 29 28-55 6 1.00-1.99 0 B 29 56-83 10 2.00-2.99 5 C 9 84-150 9 3.00-3.49 11 D 0					Gei	- nera	1	or M	 ajor	 s 5	4	Graduate Under-gr	ad 9	0		major	49
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 10 F 0 P 0 I 1 ? 0						ecti her	ves				1	#### - M response				_	'n

Molec & General Geneti

Title Instructor: Farabaugh,Phili

Enrollment: 341 Questionnaires: 189 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 158 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				eque					tructor		_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	11	41	63	73	4.04	1093/1509	4.04	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	20	47	62	57		1234/1509	3.79	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	27	37	72	46	3.66	1118/1287	3.66	4.08	4.30	4.33	3.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	73	2	18	31	36	29	3.62	1260/1459	3.62	4.02	4.22	4.26	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	4	8	30	48	90	4.18	674/1406	4.18	3.93	4.09	4.12	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	90	10	10	24	30	23	3.47	1204/1384	3.47	3.98	4.11	4.15	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	17	39	46	81	3.98	1022/1489	3.98	4.04	4.17	4.14	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	4	145	36	4.16	1320/1506	4.16	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	48	4	3	7	44	66	17	3.64	1187/1463	3.64	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	9	22	75	77	4.17	1135/1438	4.17	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	12	54	117	4.54	1130/1421	4.54	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	9	16	48	62	48	3.68	1232/1411	3.68	4.21	4.31	4.29	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	9	16	33	52	75		1132/1405	3.91	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	8	16	20	52	87	4.06	635/1236	4.06	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	81	0	25	16	26	23	18	2.94	1188/1260	2.94	3.94	4.14	4.22	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	81	0	15	19	22	18	34	3.34	1165/1255	3.34	4.27	4.33	4.37	3.34
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	85	0	8	11	29	27	29		1134/1258	3.56	4.27	4.38	4.42	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	82	79	6	5	9	4	4	2.82	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	184	3	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 198	****	4.51	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	186	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184	****	4.55	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	188	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 177	****	4.58	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	188	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	186	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	187	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	187	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	188	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.73	****
Field Work				_	_		_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	188	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	188	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	188	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	187	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utic	n									

Credits E	Carned	arned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors	;	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	59	Required for Maj	jors 166	Graduate	0	Major	82
28-55	34	1.00-1.99	0	В	67						
56-83	41	2.00-2.99	9	C	34	General	0	Under-grad	189	Non-major	107
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	30	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	60	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	s there	are not enoug	ιh

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 2

I ? Course-Section: BIOL 302L 2

Mol & Gen Genetics Lab

Title Instructor: Sandoz, James W

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 20 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 159 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	-	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	5	8	3.90	1214/1509	3.97	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	4	6	3.75	1259/1509	3.82	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	851/1287	4.23	4.08	4.30	4.33	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	5	6	3.80	1167/1459	4.03	4.02	4.22	4.26	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	4	4	6	3.65	1116/1406	3.71	3.93	4.09	4.12	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	5	8	3.95	886/1384	3.92	3.98	4.11	4.15	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	1	6	4	4	3.16	1390/1489	3.54	4.04	4.17	4.14	3.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	750/1463	4.14	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	8	8	4.16	1141/1438	4.19	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	1107/1421	4.60	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	1	8	5	3.63	1245/1411	3.81	4.21	4.31	4.29	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	3	5	7	3.79	1182/1405	4.01	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	1	2	2	7	3.79	835/1236	3.71	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1260	3.58	3.94	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1255	4.14	4.27	4.33	4.37	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1258	3.82	4.27	4.38	4.42	***
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 873	3.60	3.96	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	47/ 184	4.00	4.45	4.16	4.07	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	59/ 198	4.07	4.51	4.22	4.17	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	90/ 184	4.48	4.55	4.48	4.52	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	73/ 177	4.26	4.58	4.36	4.30	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	120/ 165	3.79	4.31	4.18	4.11	3.88

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	=			
				2	1						

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Mol & Gen Genetics Lab

Sandoz,James W

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 17

Title

Instructor:

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Page 160

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 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	8	5	2 04	1174/1509	3.97	1 21	4.31	4.32	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	3	5		1174/1509	3.82	4.09	4.26	4.32	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	500/1287	4.23	4.08	4.30	4.33	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	647/1459	4.03	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	6	4	3		1116/1406	3.71	3.93	4.09	4.12	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	718/1384	3.92	3.98	4.11	4.15	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	5	7	3.88	1120/1489	3.54	4.04	4.17	4.14	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	350/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	690/1463	4.14	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	839/1438	4.19	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	5	11		1146/1421	4.60	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	7	5		1107/1411	3.81	4.21	4.31	4.29	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	954/1405	4.01	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	0	4	4	4	3.40	1031/1236	3.71	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	1	0	2		1162/1260	3.58	3.94	4.14	4.22	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	904/1255	4.14	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3 1	1	1		1126/1258	3.82	4.27	4.38	4.42	3.60 ***
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	U	U	Т	1	1	4.00	****/ 873	3.60	3.96	4.03	4.08	^^^
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	4	1	7	4.08	104/ 184	4.00	4.45	4.16	4.07	4.08
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	156/ 198	4.07	4.51	4.22	4.17	3.85
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	93/ 184	4.48	4.55	4.48	4.52	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	99/ 177	4.26	4.58	4.36	4.30	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	140/ 165	3.79	4.31	4.18	4.11	3.54
Seminar		_	•	_			•						4 0 5	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	***	5.00	4.49	4.86	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 0

Title Mol & Gen Genetics Lab

Instructor: Sandoz, James W

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 161 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	11	2	3.60	1369/1509	3.97	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	8	6	3	3.40	1404/1509	3.82	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	11	4	3.85	1047/1287	4.23	4.08	4.30	4.33	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	3	7	5	3.63	1254/1459	4.03	4.02	4.22	4.26	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	8	5	2	3.60	1140/1406	3.71	3.93	4.09	4.12	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	8	7	2	3.56	1168/1384	3.92	3.98	4.11	4.15	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	7	5	3	3.20	1382/1489	3.54	4.04	4.17	4.14	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	350/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	7	7	2	3.69	1155/1463	4.14	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	7	8	2	3.53	1368/1438	4.19	4.45	4.46	4.43	3.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	1228/1421	4.60	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	6	5	2	3.29	1326/1411	3.81	4.21	4.31	4.29	3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	7	7	2	3.50	1265/1405	4.01	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	2	5	3	2	3.23	1082/1236	3.71	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/1260	3.58	3.94	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1255	4.14	4.27	4.33	4.37	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/1258	3.82	4.27	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 873	3.60	3.96	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	176/ 184	4.00	4.45	4.16	4.07	3.17
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	182/ 198	4.07	4.51	4.22	4.17	3.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	173/ 184	4.48	4.55	4.48	4.52	3.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	150/ 177	4.26	4.58	4.36	4.30	3.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	148/ 165	3.79	4.31	4.18	4.11	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Mol & Gen Genetics Lab

Instructor: Sandoz, James W

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 21

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 162 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncie: 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	4.14	998/1509	2 07	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	0	4.14	972/1509	3.97 3.82	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	554/1287	4.23	4.08	4.30	4.23	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	11	7	4.14	877/1459	4.03	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	768/1406	3.71	3.93	4.09	4.12	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	9	5	3.90	939/1384	3.92	3.98	4.11	4.15	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	7	7		1046/1489	3.54	4.04	4.17	4.14	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	583/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	523/1463	4.14	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	737/1438	4.19	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	691/1421	4.60	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	830/1411	3.81	4.21	4.31	4.29	4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	798/1405	4.01	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	635/1236	3.71	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	880/1260	3.58	3.94	4.14	4.22	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	862/1255	4.14	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	1033/1258	3.82	4.27	4.38	4.42	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 873	3.60	3.96	4.03	4.08	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	84/ 184	4.00	4.45	4.16	4.07	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	114/ 198	4.07	4.51	4.22	4.17	4.13
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	71/ 184	4.48	4.55	4.48	4.52	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	92/ 177	4.26	4.58	4.36	4.30	4.44
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	96/ 165	3.79	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.13

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Mol & Gen Genetics Lab

Instructor: Enrollment: Questionnaires: 16

Title

Baltimore County Fall 2009 Sandoz, James W

Page 163 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnair	e
----------------------------------------	---

			Fre	eaner	ncies			Inst	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	1	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	872/1509	3.97	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1148/1509	3.82	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	863/1287	4.23	4.08	4.30	4.33	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	834/1459	4.03	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	3	2	5	3.62	1134/1406	3.71	3.93	4.09	4.12	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	773/1384	3.92	3.98	4.11	4.15	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	2	4	4	3.50	1303/1489	3.54	4.04	4.17	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	870/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	579/1463	4.14	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	1063/1438	4.19	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	1014/1421	4.60	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	3	6	3.87	1161/1411	3.81	4.21	4.31	4.29	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	940/1405	4.01	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	630/1236	3.71	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	888/1260	3.58	3.94	4.14	4.22	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	762/1255	4.14	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	932/1258	3.82	4.27	4.38	4.42	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	671/ 873	3.60	3.96	4.03	4.08	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	106/ 184	4.00	4.45	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	78/ 198	4.07	4.51	4.22	4.17	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	93/ 184	4.48	4.55	4.48	4.52	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	141/ 177	4.26	4.58	4.36	4.30	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	100/ 165	3.79	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.08
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	3.94	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	***

Title Mol & Gen Genetics Lab

Instructor: Sandoz, James W

Enrollment:

24 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 163 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 303 1
Title Cell Biology University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Craig, Nessly C (Instr. A) Instructor: Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 78

Student	Courge	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 164

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 3 6 17 24 28 3.87 1236/1509 3.87 4.34 4.31 4.32 3.87 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 3 8 29 23 15 3.50 1372/1509 3.50 4.09 4.26 4.25 3.50 3.0 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 8 12 21 21 15 3.30 1213/1287 3.30 4.08 4.30 4.33 3.30 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 49 4 3 4 7 6 3.33 1367/1459 3.33 4.02 4.22 4.26 3.33 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 6 9 9 16 11 24 3.46 1201/1406 3.46 3.93 4.09 4.12 3.46 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 59 3 1 5 2 6 3.41 ****/1384 **** 3.98 4.11 4.15 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 2 7 9 9 17 32 3.78 1184/1489 3.78 4.04 4.17 4.14 3.78 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 1 0 3 71 4.92 466/1506 4.92 4.87 4.67 4.67 4.92 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 11 1 10 13 25 15 3 2.82 1421/1463 3.28 3.92 4.09 4.08 3.28 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 4 5 10 15 40 4.11 1173/1438 4.30 4.45 4.46 4.43 4.30 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 3 5 9 21 36 4.11 1331/1421 4.37 4.69 4.73 4.73 4.37 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 10 10 20 17 17 3.28 1328/1411 3.63 4.21 4.31 4.29 3.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 1 11 8 15 16 23 3.44 1285/1405 3.70 4.30 4.32 4.32 3.70 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 15 6 9 17 6 20 3.43 1016/1236 3.91 4.04 4.00 4.07 3.91 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 53 0 3 5 9 6 2 2.96 1177/1260 2.96 3.94 4.14 4.22 2.96 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 51 0 2 4 8 5 8 3.48 1132/1255 3.48 4.27 4.33 4.37 3.48 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 52 0 2 3 9 8 4 3.35 1182/1258 3.35 4.27 4.38 4.42 3.35 4. Were special techniques successful 51 19 3 1 2 1 1 2.50 **** 873 **** 3.96 4.03 4.08 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 77 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.45 4.16 4.07 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 77 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 198 **** 4.51 4.22 4.17 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 77 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.55 4.48 4.52 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 77 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 **** 177 **** 4.58 4.36 4.30 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 77 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 165 **** 4.31 4.18 4.11 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 77 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 89 **** 5.00 4.49 4.86 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 77 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 77 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 90 **** 5.00 4.50 4.63 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 21 Required for Majors 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 1 B 26 56-83 24 2.00-2.99 6 C 10 General 84-150 10 3.00-3.49 13 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 17 F 0 Electives Required for Majors 62 Graduate 0 Major 41 Under-grad 78 Non-major 37 0 D 1 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Ι 0 Other

Course-Section: BIOL 303 1
Title Cell Biology University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Starz-Gaiano,Mi (Instr. B) Instructor:

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 165

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 3 6 17 24 28 3.87 1236/1509 3.87 4.34 4.31 4.32 3.87 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 3 8 29 23 15 3.50 1372/1509 3.50 4.09 4.26 4.25 3.50 3.0 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 8 12 21 21 15 3.30 1213/1287 3.30 4.08 4.30 4.33 3.30 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 49 4 3 4 7 6 3.33 1367/1459 3.33 4.02 4.22 4.26 3.33 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 6 9 9 16 11 24 3.46 1201/1406 3.46 3.93 4.09 4.12 3.46 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 59 3 1 5 2 6 3.41 ****/1384 **** 3.98 4.11 4.15 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 2 7 9 9 17 32 3.78 1184/1489 3.78 4.04 4.17 4.14 3.78 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 1 0 3 71 4.92 466/1506 4.92 4.87 4.67 4.67 4.92 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14 1 1 4 17 29 12 3.75 1109/1463 3.28 3.92 4.09 4.08 3.28 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 1 0 9 13 47 4.50 800/1438 4.30 4.45 4.46 4.43 4.30 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 1 0 3 16 50 4.63 1060/1421 4.37 4.69 4.73 4.73 4.37 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 4 3 15 17 31 3.97 1079/1411 3.63 4.21 4.31 4.29 3.63 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 3 7 15 10 35 3.96 1089/1405 3.70 4.30 4.32 4.32 3.70 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 2 0 3 8 16 40 4.39 373/1236 3.91 4.04 4.00 4.07 3.91 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 53 0 3 5 9 6 2 2.96 1177/1260 2.96 3.94 4.14 4.22 2.96 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 51 0 2 4 8 5 8 3.48 1132/1255 3.48 4.27 4.33 4.37 3.48 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 52 0 2 3 9 8 4 3.35 1182/1258 3.35 4.27 4.38 4.42 3.35 4. Were special techniques successful 51 19 3 1 2 1 1 2.50 **** 873 **** 3.96 4.03 4.08 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 77 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.45 4.16 4.07 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 77 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 198 **** 4.51 4.22 4.17 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 77 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.55 4.48 4.52 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 77 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 **** 177 **** 4.58 4.36 4.30 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 77 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 165 **** 4.31 4.18 4.11 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 77 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 89 **** 5.00 4.49 4.86 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 77 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 4.54 4.67 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 77 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 90 **** 5.00 4.50 4.63 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 21 Required for Majors 28-55 4 1.00-1.99 1 B 26 56-83 24 2.00-2.99 6 C 10 General 84-150 10 3.00-3.49 13 D 1 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 17 F 0 Electives Required for Majors 62 Graduate 0 Major 41 Under-grad 78 Non-major 37 0 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant Ι 0 Other

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 1 Uni

Title Cell Biology Lab

Instructor: Mackay, Andrew B

Enrollment: 490
Ouestionnaires: 219
Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland Page 166
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

2acscromarrcs.	21)	Deddelle	COULDC	DValuacion	Queberonnai	
				Frequ	uencies	

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	16	0	6	9	26	88	74	4.06	1079/1509	4.06	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	53	0	2	4	18	56	86	4.33	785/1509	4.33	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	54	1	7	7	37	55	58	3.91	1010/1287	3.91	4.08	4.30	4.33	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	55	6	4	13	23	59	59		1000/1459	3.99	4.02	4.22	4.26	3.99
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	63	9	6	9	28	37	67	4.02		4.02	3.93	4.09	4.12	4.02
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	61	2	9	6	36	53	52	3.85		3.85	3.98	4.11	4.15	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	60	0	5	12	18	42	82	4.16	865/1489	4.16		4.17	4.14	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	63	0	0	0	2		132	4.83	722/1506	4.83	4.87	4.67		4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	38	4	2	3	35	76	61	4.08	815/1463	4.08	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	78	0	0	1	9		114	4.73	480/1438	4.73	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	78	0	1	3	11		104		1091/1421	4.60	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	81	0	0		12	26	96	4.55	556/1411	4.55	4.21		4.29	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	80	1	4	1	20	26	87	4.38		4.38		4.32		4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	91	46	6	9	17	20	30	3.72	877/1236	3.72	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	187	0	1	0	5	5	21	4.41	****/1260	****	3.94	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	186	0	1	0	9	6	17	4.15	****/1255	****	4.27	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	186	0	1	2	7	4	19		****/1258	****	4.27	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	186	11	2	3	5	5	7	3.55	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	136	0	3	4	15	24	37	4.06	104/ 184	4.06	4.45	4.16	4.07	4.06
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	138	0	0	2	9	20	50	4.46	68/ 198	4.46	4.51	4.22	4.17	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	137	0	1	1	10	27	43	4.34	129/ 184	4.34	4.55	4.48	4.52	4.34
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	137	1	1	1	9	19	51	4.46	91/ 177	4.46	4.58	4.36	4.30	4.46
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	137	0	1	7	14	22	38	4.09	99/ 165	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.09
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	216	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	216	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	216	1	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	216	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.73	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	216	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	216	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	216	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	216	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	216	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	216	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	216	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	216	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	216	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	216	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	216	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

University of Maryland

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 1 Title Cell Biology Lab Instructor: Mackay,Andrew B

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 219

490

Page 166 Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GI	PA	Expected Grades				Re	easor	ıs			Ty	pe			Majors	5
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A 59		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	Major	rs 13	35	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	126
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	в 59														
56-83	16	2.00-2.99	13	C 20		Ge	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 21	.9	Non-	-major	93
84-150	63	3.00-3.49	31	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	35	F 1		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -					gh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					1						
				? 9			_	_										
		BIOL 304 1		Un		sity (		_								_	_	167
Title		Plant Biology				imor		_	,								MAR 22,	
Instructo		Lu, Hua	(Instr	. A)	I	all	20	09								Ū	Job IRE	3R3029
Enrollmen		265		G. 1 . G				_										
	Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMB Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mea															UMBC	Level	Sect
															_			
	General																	
1. Did yo	ou gain	new insights, sk	kills fr	om this course	2	0	0	0	3	26	47	4.58	516/1509	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.58
2. Did tl	he instr	ructor make clea	ar the ex	xpected goals	2	0	0	1	5	27	43	4.47	589/1509	4.47	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.47
3. Did th	he exam	questions refle	ect the	expected goals	2	0	0	0	7	24	45	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.08	4.30	4.33	4.50
4. Did of	ther eva	luations reflec	ct the ex	xpected goals	1	45	1	1	2	8	20	4.41	619/1459	4.41	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.41
5. Did as	ssigned	readings contri	ibute to	what you learned	4	18	4	2	17	13	20	3.77	1038/1406	3.77	3.93	4.09	4.12	3.77
6. Did w	ritten a	ssignments cont	tribute	to what you learned	1	52	1	0	3	8	13	4.28	589/1384	4.28	3.98	4.11	4.15	4.28
7. Was tl	he gradi	ng system clear	rly expla	ained	3	0	0	1	8	25	41	4.41	583/1489	4.41	4.04	4.17	4.14	4.41
8. How ma	any time	es was class car	ncelled		4	1	0	1	0	1	71	4.95	350/1506	4.95	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How wo	ould you	grade the over	rall tea	ching effectiveness	12	0	0	4	14	32	16	3.91	983/1463	4.16	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.16
		Lecti	ıre															
1 Were	the inst	ructor's lectur		prepared	3	0	1	1	4	10	59	4.67	588/1438	4.78	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.78
		cuctor seem inte			3	0		0	4	7		4.80				4.73		
				explained clearly	3	0	2		12	16			936/1411			4.31		
		res contribute			2	0	2	2	6	12			634/1405		4.30	4.32		4.64
				your understanding	8	6	0	1		17			255/1236		4.04		4.07	
1 1			ussion		6.	0	-	•	0	2	_	4 00	**** /1000	ale ale ale ale	2 04	4 1 4	4 00	****
				what you learned	67	0	1	0	2	3	5		****/1260			4.14	4.22	****
		-	_	ed to participate	66	0	0	0	3	2			****/1255		4.27	4.33	4.37	****
		_		nd open discussion	66 66	0 6	0 1	0		3			****/1258		4.27	4.38	4.42	
4. were	special	techniques succ	cessiui		66	ь	Τ	U	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 873	***	3.96	4.03	4.08	^ ^ ^ ^
				Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GE	PA	Expected Grades				Re	easor	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	 2	0.00-0.99	1	A 23		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 Major		 50	 Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 or	63
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 26						-								
56-83	Ω	2 00-2 99	1	C 2		Co	nara	1				Λ	IInder-a	rad 5	70	Non-	-maior	15

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	50	Graduate	0	Major	63
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	26						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	78	Non-major	15
84-150	20	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	2				

? 3

Course-Section: BIOL 304 1 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Plant Biology Fall 2009

Instructor: Behrens, Paul W (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 265 Questionnaires: 78

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 168

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion	ns		NR	NA	Fre	-	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	al															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,sk	ills fro	om this course	2	0	0	0	3	26	47	4.58	516/1509	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.58
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clea	r the ex	xpected goals	2	0	0	1	5	27	43	4.47	589/1509	4.47	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.47
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions refle	ct the e	expected goals	2	0	0	0	7	24	45	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.08	4.30	4.33	4.50
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	1	45	1	1	2	8	20	4.41	619/1459	4.41	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.41
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contril	bute to	what you learned	4	18	4	2	17	13	20	3.77	1038/1406	3.77	3.93	4.09	4.12	3.77
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments cont:	ribute 1	to what you learned	1	52	1	0	3	8	13	4.28	589/1384	4.28	3.98	4.11	4.15	4.28
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clear	ly expla	ained	3	0	0	1	8	25	41	4.41	583/1489	4.41	4.04	4.17	4.14	4.41
	-	was class can			4	1	0	1	0	1	71	4.95	350/1506	4.95	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How wo	ould you	grade the over	all tead	ching effectiveness	15	0	0	1	4	26	32	4.41	452/1463	4.16	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.16
		Lectu																
		uctor's lectur	± ±	8	0	0	0	1	6	63	4.89	247/1438	4.78	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.78	
		in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	8	62	4.89	588/1421	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.84		
				explained clearly	8	0	0	1	2	12	55	4.73	339/1411	4.46	4.21	4.31	4.29	4.46
		es contribute		-	8	0	0	1	1	11	57	4.77	321/1405		4.30	4.32	4.32	4.64
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques e	nhance y	your understanding	13	8	0	0	5	16	36	4.54	248/1236	4.54	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.54
		Discu																
				what you learned	67	0	1	0	2	3	5		****/1260			4.14	4.22	****
				ed to participate	66	0	0	0	3	2			****/1255	****	4.27	4.33	4.37	****
		_		nd open discussion	66	0	0	0	3	3	6		****/1258		4.27	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were s	special te	echniques succ	essful		66	6	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.08	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			ТУ	pe			Majors	}
00 07	·	0.00-0.99	1	 7 02											^			62
00-27 28-55	2	A 23 B 26		ке	quir	ea I	or M	ajor	's 5	U	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r.	63		
28-55 56-83	0 8	B 26 C 3		C	nera	1				0	Under-g	d 7	'8	More	ma i a	15		
84-150	8 20	D 0		Gei	iera.	Т				U	unaer-g	rau /	0	NOU-	major	12		
84-150 Grad.	20 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	12 18	D 0 F 0		TO 7	ecti					0	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -	*** ***	0200110	.h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	Τ0	P 0		E.T.	=CLT,	ves				U	respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	ner					2	respons	בט נט ג	e sign	ııııdı		
				<u> </u>		ULI	161					4						

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Course-Section: BIOL 425 1

Immunology

29

Rosenberg, Suzan

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Page 169 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncies		_		ructor		Dept			Sect
		Question	.S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.67
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	891/1509		4.09	4.26	4.26	4.22
		estions reflec		1 3	1	11	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	453/1287		4.08	4.30	4.38	4.57
4. Did oth	her evalī	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	553/1459	4.44	4.02	4.22	4.32	4.44
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	1	1	0	5	5	6	3.88	949/1406	3.88	3.93	4.09	4.11	3.88
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	649/1384	4.22	3.98	4.11	4.23	4.22
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	1	1	5	2	9	3.94	1058/1489	3.94	4.04	4.17	4.18	3.94
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	883/1506	4.72	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.72
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	.ll tead	hing effectiveness	s 1	1	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	786/1463	4.12	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.12
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.50
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	846/1421	4.78	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.78
		xplained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	5	7	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.21	4.31	4.35	4.00		
		es contribute t		-	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	634/1405		4.30	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	4	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	520/1236	4.21	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.21
		Discus																
				what you learned	17		0	0	0	0	2		****/1260			4.14	4.25	****
				d to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1255		4.27	4.33	4.46	****
		_		d open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1258		4.27	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	sstul		17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.26	****
				Freq	quency	y Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	5			Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	3	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		El	ecti	ves			1	L2	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0			_						respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot	her					1						

Course-Section: BIOL 426 1 Title

Appr To Molecular Biol

Oneill, Michael Instructor:

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 7 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 170 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

			Fre	equer	ncies		_		tructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA		2 	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	724/1509	4.40	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1331/1509	3.60	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1229/1287	3.20	4.08	4.30	4.38	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	770/1459	4.25	4.02	4.22	4.32	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	587/1406	4.25	3.93	4.09	4.11	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	3.98	4.11	4.23	***
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	823/1489	4.20	4.04	4.17	4.18	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.87	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1168/1463	3.67	3.92	4.09	4.18	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	Ο	Ο	0	0	Ο	5	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	0	2		1256/1411	3.60	4.21	4.31	4.35	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	940/1405	4.20	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1235/1236		4.04	4.00	4.03	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	3.94	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.27	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.27	4.38	4.51	5.00

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

Course-Section: BIOL 430 1 University of Maryland Title Biological Chemistry

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Bustos, Mauricio Instructor:

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 13

Page 171 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	648/1509	4.46	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1148/1509	3.92	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	739/1287	4.31	4.08	4.30	4.38	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1207/1459	3.73	4.02	4.22	4.32	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1166/1406	3.54	3.93	4.09	4.11	3.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	807/1384		3.98	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.04	4.17	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4		1222/1506	4.31	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	853/1463	4.00	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1182/1438	4.08	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	979/1421	4.69	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	964/1411	4.15	4.21	4.31	4.35	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	911/1405	4.23	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	3	2	5	3.67	904/1236	3.67	4.04	4.00	4.03	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	701/1260	4.13	3.94	4.14	4.25	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	4	1		1054/1255	3.75	4.27	4.33	4.46	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	4	1		1118/1258	3.63	4.27	4.38	4.51	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.00	3.96	4.03	4.26	3.00

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

Course-Section: BIOL 442 1 University of Maryland Title Developmental Biology

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Blumberg, Daphne (Instr. A) Instructor:

Enrollment: 255 Questionnaires: 69

Page 172 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questio	nnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------	--------

		Ouestion	ng		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncie	es 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Ran		Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera																	
		ew insights,sk			0	0	1	3	7	21	37		833/1		4.30	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.30
		ctor make clea			2	0	0	6	12	31	18		1156/1		3.91	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.91
		estions refle			1	0	1	3	14	36	14		1042/1		3.87	4.08	4.30	4.38	3.87
		ations reflec			1	46	1	2	10	5	4		1342/1		3.41	4.02	4.22	4.32	3.41
				what you learned	3	4	13	7	14	19	9		1324/1		3.06	3.93	4.09	4.11	3.06
				o what you learned	3	54	2	0	3	4	3		****/1		****	3.98	4.11	4.23	****
		g system clear		ined	3	2	6	6	11	23	18		1245/1		3.64	4.04	4.17	4.18	3.64
		was class can			1	3	0	0	1	1	63		292/1		4.95	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How wo	ula you g	grade the over	all teac	hing effectiveness	12	1	5	4	28	18	1	3.11	1381/1	463	3.63	3.92	4.09	4.18	3.63
		Lectu	re																
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectur	es well	prepared	3	0	1	3	10	24	28	4.14	1154/1	438	4.42	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.42
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inte	rested i	n the subject	2	0	1	3	7	18	38	4.33	1263/1	421	4.59	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.59
3. Was le	as lecture material presented and explained clear id the lectures contribute to what you learned						3	6	25	19	13	3.50	1277/1	411	3.93	4.21	4.31	4.35	3.93
4. Did th	id the lectures contribute to what you learned id audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						2	2	10	23	29	4.14	980/1	405	4.34	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.34
5. Did au	diovisual	our understanding	3	5	3	8	12	19	19	3.70	883/1	236	3.90	4.04	4.00	4.03	3.90		
		Discu																	
1. Did cl.	ass discu			what you learned	50	0	5	2	3	7	2	2.95	1184/1	260	2.95	3.94	4.14	4.25	2.95
				d to participate	50	0	3	2	3	7	4		1161/1		3.37	4.27	4.33	4.46	3.37
				d open discussion	51	0	4	1	5	3	5		1205/1		3.22	4.27	4.38	4.51	3.22
		echniques succ		a open arroadri	51	10	3	1	2	1	1		****/		****	3.96	4.03	4.26	****
	-	_																	
		Labora	-																
1. Did th	e lab inc	crease underst	anding o	f the material	67	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	184	****	4.45	4.16	4.62	****
		Field																	
1. Did fi	eld exper	rience contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	68	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
				Frequ	iency	, Dis	trib	utic	n										
		Cum. GP																	
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	າຣ				Тур	pe 			Majors	S 		
00-27	5	A 18		Re	quire	ed f	or M	Major	s 5	7	Grad	uate	е	0	Majo	or	61		
28-55																			
56-83							nera:	1				1	Unde	r-gı	rad 6	9	Non-	major	8
84-150																			
Grad.	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0			Means t			_	gh .		
				P 0									resp	onse	es to b	e sign	uficar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot	her					2							
			? 2																

Course-Section: BIOL 442 1 University of Maryland Title Developmental Biology

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 173 MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Brewster, Rachel (Instr. B) Instructor:

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 69 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor 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 0 0 1 3 7 21 37 4.30 833/1509 4.30 4.34 4.31 4.39 4.30 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 0 6 12 31 18 3.91 1156/1509 3.91 4.09 4.26 4.26 3.91 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 1 3 14 36 14 3.87 1042/1287 3.87 4.08 4.30 4.38 3.87 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 46 1 2 10 5 4 3.41 1342/1459 3.41 4.02 4.22 4.32 3.41 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 4 13 7 14 19 9 3.06 1324/1406 3.06 3.93 4.09 4.11 3.06 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 54 2 0 3 4 3 3.50 ****/1384 **** 3.98 4.11 4.23 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 2 6 6 11 23 18 3.64 1245/1489 3.64 4.04 4.17 4.18 3.64 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 3 0 0 1 1 63 4.95 292/1506 4.95 4.87 4.67 4.67 4.95

Lecture

<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	4	0	0	0	3	13	49	4.71	531/1438	4.42	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	6	58	4.85	691/1421	4.59	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	4	26	33	4.37	779/1411	3.93	4.21	4.31	4.35	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	3	18	42	4.54	605/1405	4.34	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	1	3	10	20	25	4.10	616/1236	3.90	4.04	4.00	4.03	3.90

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 12 1 0 1 6 33 16 4.14 750/1463 3.63 3.92 4.09 4.18 3.63

Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	50	0	5	2	3	7	2	2.95 1184/1260	2.95	3.94	4.14	4.25	2.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	3	2	3	7	4	3.37 1161/1255	3.37	4.27	4.33	4.46	3.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	51	0	4	1	5	3	5	3.22 1205/1258	3.22	4.27	4.38	4.51	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	51	10	3	1	2	1	1	2.50 ****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.26	****

Laboratory

67 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 184 **** 4.45 4.16 4.62 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material

Field Work

1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 68 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** **** 4.39 4.75 ****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Expected Grades Cum. GPA Reasons Majors Required for Majors 57 Graduate 00-27 5 0.00-0.99 A 18 Major 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 В 33 56-83 2.00-2.99 8 C 10 General 1 Under-grad 69 Non-major 8 84-150 29 3.00-3.49 16 D 1 3.50-4.00 22 F 0 0 #### - Means there are not enough Grad. 0 Electives Ρ Ω responses to be significant I 0 Other 2 ? 2

Course-Section: BIOL 444 1 University of Maryland

I

0

0

Title Development And Cancer Baltimore County
Instructor: Bieberich, Charl Fall 2009

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 174

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

				Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	235/1509	4.81	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.81
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	141/1509	4.88	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.88
3. Did th	ie exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	337/1287	4.69	4.08	4.30	4.38	4.69
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	67/1459	4.94	4.02	4.22	4.32	4.94
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	63/1406	4.94	3.93	4.09	4.11	4.94
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	81/1384	4.88	3.98	4.11	4.23	4.88
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	145/1489	4.81	4.04	4.17	4.18	4.81
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	408/1506	4.94	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	81/1463	4.91	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.91
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1438	4.87	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.87
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1421	4.94	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	232/1411	4.81	4.21	4.31	4.35	4.81
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	432/1405	4.69	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.69
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	3	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	306/1236	4.46	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.46
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	370/1260	4.57	3.94	4.14	4.25	4.57
2. Were a	ıll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	390/1255	4.71	4.27	4.33	4.46	4.71
				d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.27	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	-	10	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.26	***
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	atio	n									
Credits E	'own od	Cum. GPA		Ermoated Credes				Do	2020				т.				Moder	
crearrs E	arnea	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				ке:	asons				Ту	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 9		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	6	Graduat	e	3	Majo	or	9
28-55	0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4																	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General					0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	8		
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				6	#### -				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
												_						

Other

2

Course-Section: BIOL 451 1 University of Maryland

Title Baltimore County Neurobiology Instructor: Robinson, Phylli (Instr. A) Fall 2009

Enrollment: 34

Questionnaires: 22

Page 175 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	1	1	6	14	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	10	6	3.86	1196/1509	3.86	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	8	4.23	803/1287	4.23	4.08	4.30	4.38	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	1088/1459	3.90	4.02	4.22	4.32	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	8	5	3.76	1038/1406	3.76	3.93	4.09	4.11	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	11	6	3.95	873/1384	3.95	3.98	4.11	4.23	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	8	5	7	3.86	1141/1489	3.86	4.04	4.17	4.18	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.87	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	7	5	3.89	998/1463	3.89	3.92	4.09	4.18	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	9	10	4.23	1094/1438	4.41	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	17		1049/1421	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	9	7		1098/1411	3.98	4.21	4.31		3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	12	4.27	881/1405	4.23	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	520/1236		4.04	4.00	4.03	
Discussion			•	•		_	_		105/1050	4 40			4 0=	4 40
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	496/1260	4.42	3.94	4.14	4.25	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.27	4.33	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.27	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	196/ 873	4.55	3.96	4.03	4.26	4.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.51	4.22	4.37	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.55	4.48	4.66	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.58	4.36	4.47	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.29	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.83	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.69	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.64	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.73	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.54	****
	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18		****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	****	4.18	4.19 4.07	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 44		****	4.32	4.07	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	***

Course-Section: BIOL 451 1 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Neurobiology Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Robinson, Phylli (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 175

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	 А	14	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	3	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	12
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 451 1

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 22

Neurobiology

34

Title Instructor: Lin,Weihong

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 176 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	2		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«»»»			<del>-</del>											
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	10	6	3.86	1196/1509	3.86	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	8	4.23	803/1287	4.23	4.08	4.30	4.38	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	1088/1459	3.90	4.02	4.22	4.32	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	8	5	3.76	1038/1406	3.76	3.93	4.09	4.11	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	11	6	3.95	873/1384	3.95	3.98	4.11	4.23	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	8	5	7	3.86	1141/1489	3.86	4.04	4.17	4.18	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.87	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	2	2	9	4	3.88	998/1463	3.89	3.92	4.09	4.18	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	687/1438	4.41	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	639/1421	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	7	9	4.00	1051/1411	3.98	4.21	4.31	4.35	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	5	12	4.18	947/1405	4.23	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	338/1236	4.32	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.32
Discussion				_	_	_	_							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	496/1260	4.42	3.94	4.14	4.25	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.27	4.33	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.27	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	196/ 873	4.55	3.96	4.03	4.26	4.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 184	****	1 1E	1 16	4.62	****
<u> </u>	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.45	4.16	4.62	****
<ol> <li>Were you provided with adequate background information</li> <li>Were necessary materials available for lab activities</li> </ol>	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 184	****	4.51	4.22	4.37	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 177	****	4.55 4.58	4.46	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.47	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	21	U	U	U	U	U		3.00	/ 103		1.51	1.10	1.27	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced		•	•				_					4 0 5		
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	1.55	****/ 49	***	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	***	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	* * * *	^ ^ * *	4.27	4.33	^ ^ * *

Course-Section: BIOL 451 1 Title

Neurobiology

Instructor: Lin,Weihong Enrollment: 34

Questionnaires: 22

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 176 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	14	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	3	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	12
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other		_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 483 1 University of Maryland Title Evol: Genes To Genomes

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Leips, Jeffery W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 18

Page 177 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

- ·				
Student	('Ollive')	Evaluation	Ougetion	n $n$ $n$ $n$ $n$

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
_	_	ew insights,ski			0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61			4.34			4.61
		ctor make clear		_	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	519/1509	4.53	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.53
	_	uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61		4.61	4.08	4.30	4.38	4.61
		uations reflect		_	0	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.02	4.22	4.32	4.67
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61		4.61	3.93	4.09	4.11	4.61
		-		to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3		4.35	,		3.98	4.11	4.23	4.35
		g system clearl		ained	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44		4.44	4.04	4.17	4.18	4.44
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94		4.94	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	.ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	118/1463	4.53	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.53
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1438	4.80	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.80
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421	4.98	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.98
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	159/1411	4.61	4.21	4.31	4.35	4.61
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	194/1405	4.57	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	0	14	4.69	164/1236	4.60	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.60
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1260	4.89	3.94	4.14	4.25	4.89
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learne Were all students actively encouraged to participat				9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	221/1255	4.89	4.27	4.33	4.46	4.89
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	261/1258	4.89	4.27	4.38	4.51	4.89
4. Were s	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussic . Were special techniques successful			-	9	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	105/ 873	4.78	3.96	4.03	4.26	4.78
		Labora	torv															
1. Did th	ne lab inc		-	of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	19/ 184	4.86	4.45	4.16	4.62	4.86
				ground information	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	4.51	4.22	4.37	5.00
				for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	36/ 184	4.83	4.55	4.48	4.66	4.83
		structor provid			12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.58	4.36	4.47	5.00
				learly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	21/ 165	4.83	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.83
		Semina	r															
1 Were a	ssianed t			e announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
	_	-		dividual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	5.00	4.54	4.83	****
				what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.69	****
	_	ons contribute		-	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.64	****
_		for grading mad		-	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	4.32	****
				Fire 2					_									
				Frequ	lency	DIS	LIDI	ucio	.1									
Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	<b>;</b>			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s 1	0	Graduat	e	2	Majo	or	6
28-55																		
56-83						Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	12
84-150																		
Grad.					Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh	
P 0											respons	es to k	e sign	nificar	ıt			
	I 0					Oth	ner					0						
	? 1																	

Course-Section: BIOL 483 1 University of Maryland Title Evol: Genes To Genomes

Baltimore County

Page 178

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Mendelson, Tamra (Instr. B) Fall 2009 Enrollment: Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Sect Mean
General		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 1 1 2 14 4.61 470/1509 4.61 4.34	4.31 4.39 4	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 6 10 4.53 519/1509 4.53 4.09		4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 5 12 4.61 414/1287 4.61 4.08		4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 1 15 4.67 280/1459 4.67 4.02		4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 2 14 4.61 261/1406 4.61 3.93		4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 2 3 11 4.35 505/1384 4.35 3.98	4.11 4.23 4	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 2 3 12 4.44 541/1489 4.44 4.04	4.17 4.18 4	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 350/1506 4.94 4.87	4.67 4.67 4	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 6 9 4.60 248/1463 4.53 3.92	4.09 4.18 4	4.53
Lecture		
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 1 17 4.94 131/1438 4.80 4.45	4.46 4.50 4	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $0$ $1$ $17$ $4.94$ $322/1421$ $4.98$ $4.69$	4.73 4.76 4	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 3 15 4.83 211/1411 4.61 4.21		4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 15 $4.78$ 321/1405 $4.57$ $4.30$		4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 1 1 1 13 4.63 199/1236 4.60 4.04	4.00 4.03 4	4.60
Discussion		
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 150/1260 4.89 3.94		4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 221/1255 4.89 4.27		4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion $9$ 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 261/1258 4.89 4.27		4.89
4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 105/ 873 4.78 3.96	4.03 4.26 4	4.78
Laboratory		
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material $$ 1 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 19/184 4.86 4.45		4.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information $12$ 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 $1/$ 198 5.00 4.51		5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 36/184 4.83 4.55		4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 0 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/177 5.00 4.58		5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 21/165 4.83 4.31	4.18 4.29 4	4.83
Seminar		
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $$ 17 $$ 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 89 **** 5.00	4.49 4.71 *	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $17$ 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 89 **** 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention $17$ 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00	4.54 4.83 *	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $17$ 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 89 **** 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention $17$ 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned $17$ 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 5.00	4.54 4.83 * 4.50 4.69 *	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 89 **** 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50	4.54 4.83 * 4.50 4.69 * 4.38 4.64 *	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $17 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 5.00 ****/ 89 **** 5.00   2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00   3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 5.00   $	4.54 4.83 * 4.50 4.69 * 4.38 4.64 *	***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 89 **** 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50	4.54 4.83 * 4.50 4.69 * 4.38 4.64 *	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 89 **** 5.00 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 5.00 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 90 **** 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 **** 4.50 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 **** 4.50	4.54 4.83 * 4.50 4.69 * 4.38 4.64 *	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4.54 4.83 * 4.50 4.69 * 4.38 4.64 * 4.06 4.32 *  Majors	****  ***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4.54 4.83 * 4.50 4.69 * 4.38 4.64 * 4.06 4.32 *	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4.54 4.83 * 4.50 4.69 * 4.38 4.64 * 4.06 4.32 *  Majors  Major	**** **** ****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4.54 4.83 * 4.50 4.69 * 4.38 4.64 * 4.06 4.32 *  Majors  Major	****  ***
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4.54 4.83 * 4.50 4.69 * 4.38 4.64 * 4.06 4.32 *  Majors  Major  Non-major	**** **** ****  6
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4.54 4.83 * 4.50 4.69 * 4.38 4.64 * 4.06 4.32 *  Majors  Major  Non-major  re not enough	**** **** ****  6

? 1

Course-Section: BIOL 483 1 University of Maryland

D

F

Ρ

Ι

0

0

0

0

1

Questionnaires: 18

84-150

Grad.

5

2

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 179 MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title Evol: Genes To Genomes Omland, Kevin E (Instr. C) Fall 2009 Instructor: Enrollment:

	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA		2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0		0	1	1	2	14	4.61				4.31	4.39	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1		0	0	1	6	10	4.53	519/1509		4.09	4.26	4.26	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0		0	0	1	5	12	4.61	414/1287		4.08	4.30	4.38	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0		0	1	1	1	15	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.02	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		-	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	261/1406		3.93	4.09	4.11	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn			1	0	2	3	11	4.35	505/1384		3.98	4.11	4.23	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	•	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	541/1489		4.04	4.17	4.18	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0		0	0	0	1	17	4.94	350/1506		4.87	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ss 3	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	690/1463	4.53	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	1	13	4.44	878/1438	4.80	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0		0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421	4.98	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	. 0		0	2	2	6	8	4.11	992/1411	4.61	4.21	4.31	4.35	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	1	10		1024/1405		4.30	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	.g 2	0	0	1	2	1	12		274/1236		4.04	4.00	4.03	4.60
Discussion		_												
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1260	4.89	3.94	4.14	4.25	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		-	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	221/1255		4.27	4.33	4.46	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	1	8	4.89	261/1258	4.89	4.27	4.38	4.51	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	105/ 873	4.78	3.96	4.03	4.26	4.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	. 0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	19/ 184	4.86	4.45	4.16	4.62	4.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background informati	on 12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	4.51	4.22	4.37	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities		0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	36/ 184	4.83	4.55	4.48	4.66	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.58	4.36	4.47	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	21/ 165	4.83	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.83
Seminar	1.5		0	0	0	•	-	F 00	****	ale ale ale ale	F 00	4 40	4 51	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme			0	0	0	0	1		****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention			0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	0	1		****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17 17		0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92 ****/ 93		4.50	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	Ι/	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	***/ 93		4.50	4.06	4.32	
Fr	equenc	y Di	strib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	les			Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6		Re	equir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	10	Graduat	е	2	Majo	r	6
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 8				,					1	, .	_			
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 3 C 0		Ge	enera	ıΤ				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	12

Electives

Other

2

0

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland

Course-Section: BIOL 625 1 Baltimore County Fall 2009 Title Immunology Rosenberg, Suzan Instructor: Enrollment: 29

Page 180 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	---	---------	--------	------------	---------------

				Frequencies						Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1 Did way gain now		nom this source	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.39	5.00
<ol> <li>Did you gain new</li> <li>Did the instruct</li> </ol>			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.09	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evalua		1 3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		1422/1459	3.00	4.09	4.22	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned rea			0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.93	4.22	4.12	4.00
_	_	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.98	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading	-	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.04	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times w		Tarned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.87	4.17	4.71	5.00
-		abing offostivonoss	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	3.92	4.09	4.15	5.00
9. How would you gr	How would you grade the overall teaching effective						U	U	Τ.	5.00	1/1403	5.00	3.92	4.09	4.15	5.00
1. Were the instruc	Lecture . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared				0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture mate		•	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.21	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.30	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.04	4.00	3.98	5.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	3.94	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all student			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.27	4.33	4.43	5.00
	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.27	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful				0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.96	4.03	4.01	4.00
	Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Rea	asons	3			Туј	рe			Majors				

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

Course-Section: BIOL 626 1

Approaches To Molec Bi

Title Approaches To M Instructor: Oneill, Michael

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 10

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 181 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	<b>;</b>		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	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1032/1509	4.11	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	3	0		1463/1509		4.09	4.26	4.25	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	3	1		1225/1287	3.22	4.08	4.30	4.22	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	4	1		1212/1459	3.71	4.02	4.22	4.16	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	4		623/1406		3.93	4.09	4.12	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1384	****	3.98	4.11	4.16	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1188/1489	3.78	4.04	4.17	4.14	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.87	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1194/1463	3.63	3.92	4.09	4.15	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1160/1438	4.13	4.45	4.46	4.49	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	1162/1421	4.50	4.69	4.73	4.78	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	1204/1411	3.75	4.21	4.31	4.33	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	987/1405	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.33	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	1197/1236	2.50	4.04	4.00	3.98	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	370/1260		3.94	4.14	4.21	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.27	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14		4.14	4.27	4.38	4.50	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.51	4.22	4.31	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.55	4.48	4.11	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 177	****	4.58	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92		5.00	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00		****	5.00	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92		4.50	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work	0	0	•	0	0	0	-	F 00	***** / 40			4 20	1 26	
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -			4.41	4.40	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, -:	****	****	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced	•		0	0	0		•	4 00	****	4.4.4.	444	4 06	4 16	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.16	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.26	****

Course-Section: BIOL 626 1

Title Approaches To Molec Bi

Instructor: Oneill, Michael

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 181 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland Adv Molec Biol Lab Baltimore County

Title

Instructor: Wolf,Julia B
Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2009

Page 182 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	176/1509	4.89	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	234/1509	4.78	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	304/1287	4.71	4.08	4.30	4.22	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1459	4.88	4.02	4.22	4.16	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	423/1406	4.43	3.93	4.09	4.12	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	149/1384	4.75	3.98	4.11	4.16	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.04	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.87	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	271/1463	4.57	3.92	4.09	4.15	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	247/1438	4.89	4.45	4.46	4.49	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	7		1014/1421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.78	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1411	4.89	4.21	4.31	4.33	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	194/1405	4.89	4.30	4.32	4.33	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	383/1236	4.38	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	209/1260	4.80	3.94	4.14	4.21	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.27	4.33	4.43	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.27	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	3.96	4.03	4.01	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	17/ 184	4.88	4.45	4.16	4.07	4.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	59/ 198	4.50	4.51	4.22	4.31	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	176/ 184	3.75	4.55	4.48	4.11	3.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	46/ 177	4.75	4.58	4.36	4.41	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	52/ 165	4.50	4.31	4.18	4.25	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.45	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.26	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 0 .

Course-Section: BIOL 642 2

Intro To Dev Biology

Title Instructor: Blumberg, Daphne (Instr. A)

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 4

8

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 183 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quest 10115														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1259/1509	3.75	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1091/1287	3.75	4.08	4.30	4.22	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.02	4.22	4.16	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	587/1406	4.25	3.93	4.09	4.12	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.98	4.11	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.04	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.87	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1241/1463	3.75	3.92	4.09	4.15	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.45	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	885/1411	4.63	4.21	4.31	4.33	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	634/1405	4.75	4.30	4.32	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	664/1236	4.25	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	5.00	3.94	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.27	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	801/873	3.00	3.96	4.03	4.01	3.00
i. Were special techniques successial		1	1	U	U	U		3.00	001/ 0/3	3.00	3.90	1.03	1.01	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 92	4.50	4.50	4.38	4.30	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	33/ 93	4.50	4.50	4.06	4.04	4.50

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

Course-Section: BIOL 642 2

Title Intro To Dev Biology Instructor:

Enrollment: 8

Baltimore County Brewster, Rachel (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Fall 2009

Page 184 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0		1259/1509	3.75	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	2		1091/1287	3.75	4.08	4.30	4.22	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.02	4.22	4.16	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	587/1406	4.25	3.93	4.09	4.12	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.98	4.11	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.04	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.87	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	853/1463	3.75	3.92	4.09	4.15	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.45	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1411	4.63	4.21	4.31	4.33	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1405	4.75	4.30	4.32	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	274/1236	4.25	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	5.00	3.94	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.27	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.27	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.00	3.96	4.03	4.01	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 92	4.50	4.50	4.38	4.30	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	33/ 93	4.50	4.50	4.06	4.04	4.50

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

Course-Section: BIOL 700 1 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title Intro To Grad Experien Cronin, Thomas W Instructor:

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 10

MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 185

	Ouestionnaire

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	Ω	0	Ο	4	5	4.56	540/1509	4.56	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	483/1509		4.09	4.26	4.25	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.08	4.30	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	770/1459	4.25	4.02	4.22	4.16	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	949/1406		3.93	4.09	4.12	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	3.98	4.11	4.16	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	728/1489	4.29	4.04	4.17	4.14	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506		4.87	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	438/1463		3.92	4.09	4.15	
J. non nouth for grade one overthe conting creativeness	J	ŭ	Ü	ŭ	ŭ	-		1.15	1507 1105	11.15	3.72	1.05	1110	1.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	930/1438	4.40	4.45	4.46	4.49	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	496/1411	4.60	4.21	4.31	4.33	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1405	4.60	4.30	4.32	4.33	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1236	****	4.04	4.00	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	352/1260	4.60	3.94	4.14	4.21	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	412/1255	4.70	4.27	4.33	4.43	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.27	4.38	4.50	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	261/ 873	4.40	3.96	4.03	4.01	4.40
From	onar	niat	-rihi	1+101	2									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	 А	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	3	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	3			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						