Concepts Of Biology Sokolove,Philli Title

Instructor:

Enrollment: 308 Questionnaires: 211

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 146 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	9	14	56	66	64	3.78	1249/1447	3.61	4.48	4.31	4.18	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	12	20	47	77	54	3.67	1258/1447	3.53	4.28	4.27	4.30	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	14	20	46	60	68	3.71	1080/1241	3.44	4.26	4.33	4.25	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	70	18	10	30	48	33	3.49	1268/1402	3.36	4.27	4.24	4.15	3.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	10	7	21	73	92	4.13	718/1358	3.95	4.09	4.11	4.03	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	92	17	13	23	36	25	3.34	1196/1316	3.36	4.13	4.14	3.99	3.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	13	33	44	59	56		1246/1427	3.51	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	3		189	4.90		4.90	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	51	3	8	22	60	60	7	3.23	1320/1434		4.03	4.10	4.10	3.23
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	3	7	35	89	72	4.07	1156/1387	3.97	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	3	11	51	139	4.58	1072/1387	4.31	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	11	24	53	73	44	3.56	1245/1386	3.55	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	25	37	49	45	47		1297/1380	3.35	4.38	4.32	4.31	3.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	6	15	26	45	51	56		943/1193		4.14		3.99	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	22	15	42	53	51	3.52	990/1172	3.46	4.14	4.15	3.95	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	5	11	26	52	89	4.14	803/1182	3.80	4.29	4.35	4.18	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	9	13	37	47	77	3.93	925/1170	3.48	4.34	4.38	4.17	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	29	15	12	14	36	42	63	3.78	573/ 800	3.78	4.20	4.06	3.95	3.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	205	2	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 189	3.84	4.74	4.34	4.18	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	206	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	****/ 192	4.07	4.68	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	206	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 186	4.47	4.70	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	206	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 187	4.10	4.67	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	206	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 168	3.89	4.48	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	208	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	208	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	208	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	208	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	208	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	208	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	208	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	208	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	208	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	208	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	208	0	1	1	1	0	0		****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	208	2	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	208	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	****	5.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	208	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	4.31	****

Title

Concepts Of Biology Sokolove,Philli Instructor:

Enrollment: 308 Questionnaires: 211

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 146 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons	5	Type		Majors	5
00-27	63	0.00-0.99	1	A	62	Required for Ma	ajors 169	Graduate	0	Major	62
28-55	38	1.00-1.99	2	В	57						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	16	C	51	General	11	Under-grad	211	Non-major	149
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	31	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	70	F	2	Electives	1	#### - Mean	s there	are not enoug	_j h
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				?	9						

Concepts Of Biology La Title

Instructor: Claassen,Lark A

Enrollment:

238 Questionnaires: 88 Baltimore County Spring 2010

University of Maryland

Page 147 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eane	ncie	25		Tng	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	5	10	29	25	16	3.44	1354/1447	3.61	4.48	4.31	4.18	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	10	11	21	20	22	3.39	1351/1447	3.53	4.28	4.27	4.30	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	14	16	15	21	19	3.18	1201/1241	3.44	4.26	4.33	4.25	3.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	9	21	16	18	20	3.23	1337/1402	3.36	4.27	4.24	4.15	3.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	4	6	22	25	26	3.76	1022/1358	3.95	4.09	4.11	4.03	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	10	7	25	19	19	3.38	1184/1316	3.36	4.13	4.14	3.99	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	10	11	15	23	24	3.48	1265/1427	3.51	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	8	74	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	8	13	27	10	8	2.95	1365/1434	3.09	4.03	4.10	4.10	2.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	7	3	13	29	29	3.86	1238/1387	3.97	4.48	4.46	4.46	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	5	5	14	15	43		1313/1387	4.31	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.05
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	7	10	17	27	20	3.53	1251/1386	3.55	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	12	8	17	20	24		1260/1380	3.35	4.38	4.32	4.31	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	13	8	16	18	24	3.41	999/1193	3.48	4.14	4.02	3.99	3.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	60	0	4	5	6	2	11	3.39	1026/1172	3.46	4.14	4.15	3.95	3.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	60	0	5	3	4	6	10		1089/1182	3.80	4.29	4.35	4.18	3.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	61	0	6	6	3	5	7		1136/1170	3.48	4.34	4.38	4.17	3.04
4. Were special techniques successful	61	7	4	2	4	2	8		****/ 800		4.20	4.06	3.95	****
									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	3	3	15	20	20	3.84	162/ 189	3.84	4.74	4.34	4.18	3.84
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	3	14	20	24	4.07	144/ 192	4.07	4.68	4.34	4.31	4.07
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	1	6	17	36	4.47	114/ 186	4.47	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.47
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	2	3	12	14	30	4.10	140/ 187	4.10	4.67	4.33	4.37	4.10
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	5	6	10	10	30	3.89	130/ 168	3.89	4.48	4.20	4.29	3.89
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	79	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	81	0	3	1	0	1	2	2.71	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	81	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	82	0	1	0	2	2	1		****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	81	1	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	81	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	81	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	81	1	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	82	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	81	2	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	80	0	3	0	1	3	1	2.88	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	80	1	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	80	2	3	1	0	1	1	2.33		****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	81	1	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	80	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	4.31	****

Title Concepts Of Biology La

Instructor: Claassen, Lark A

Enrollment: 238
Questionnaires: 88

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 147 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	26	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	67	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	В	36						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	10	C	10	General	1	Under-grad	88	Non-major	74
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	25	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 123 01
Title Human Genetics

Instructor: Human Genetics
Wagner, Cynthia

Enrollment: 87
Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 148 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eaue	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	2	8	9	16	4.11	998/1447	4.11	4.48	4.31	4.18	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	11	19	4.37	715/1447	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	7	10	14	3.91	982/1241	3.91	4.26	4.33	4.25	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	7	12	13	4.12		4.12	4.27	4.24	4.15	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	7	5	20	4.17	681/1358	4.17	4.09	4.11	4.03	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	7	8	19	4.29	590/1316	4.29	4.13	4.14	3.99	4.29
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	1	0	1	1	5	11	16	4.18		4.18	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	- ,	4.94	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	3	7	12	2	3.54	1218/1434	3.54	4.03	4.10	4.10	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	10	8	16	1 10	1098/1387	4.18	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	o 7	16 24		1042/1387	4.10	4.40	4.73		4.10
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	8	15	9		1119/1386	3.91	4.70	4.73	4.71 4.32	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	5	16	11		1000/1380	4.09	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	5	16 7	19	4.09	395/1193		4.38	4.32	3.99	4.09
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	۷	U	1	5	,	19	4.30	393/1193	4.30	4.14	4.02	3.99	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	4	6	3	3.53	986/1172	3.53	4.14	4.15	3.95	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	774/1182	4.19	4.29	4.35	4.18	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	632/1170	4.44	4.34	4.38	4.17	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	1	2	6	3		3.21	728/ 800	3.21		4.06		3.21
									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.74	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.68	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.70	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.67	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.48	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.75	****
nd of districts														
Field Work	20	0	-	_	_	•	_	2 6 1	***** / 20	also also also also	F 00	4 40	2 02	at at at at
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28 28	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.57	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.72	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.43	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.36	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	4	0	1	1	0	1		****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	4	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	4.49	****
J. WELE CHELE EHOUGH PLOCEOUS FOR ALL CHE SCUGENES	20	-1	U	U	Т	Τ.	Τ	4.00	/ 15		5.00	4.UI	±.31	

Course-Section: BIOL 123 01 Title Human Genetics Instructor: Wagner,Cynthia University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 148 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 87

Questionnaires: 35

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	13	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	С	5	General	16	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 233 01 University of Maryland Title Nutrition And Health Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Host,Laurie A

Instructor: Enrollment: 64 Questionnaires: 45

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 149

Job IRBR3029

		Question	ns		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		_		Level Mean	
		Genera						_	_	_								
_	_	ew insights,sk			0	0	0	0	2	5	38	4.80	254/1447		4.48	4.31		
		ctor make clear		1 3	0	0	0	0	2	9	34	4.71	292/1447	4.71	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.71
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	2	0	7	36	4.71	323/1241	4.71	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.71
		uations reflect			0	22	0 1	1	2	6	14	4.43	579/1402		4.27	4.24	4.24	4.43
	_	-		what you learned	0	13	_	-	3	9	19		452/1358		4.09	4.11	4.12	4.41
		_		o what you learned	0	31	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	,		4.13	4.14	4.08	4.36
		g system clear		inea	0	0	0	0	1	6	38	4.82	- ,		4.22	4.19	4.14	4.82
	-	was class cand			1	0	0	0	•	7	37	4.84			4.75	4.69	4.70	4.84
9. How wor	ula you g	grade the over	all tead	hing effectiveness	12	0	U	U	3	19	11	4.24	645/1434	4.24	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.24
		Lectu																
11			2	0	0	_	_	_	2.17	4 06	061/1005	4 06	4 40	1 16	4 40	4 06		
	re the instructor's lectures well prepared d the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	6	37	4.86			4.48	4.46	4.42	4.86
				_	2	0	0	0	1	6	36	4.81	,	4.81	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.81
		-		xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	34	4.77	303/1386		4.28	4.32	4.24	4.77
		es contribute t		-	2	0	0	0	1	5	37	4.84	,		4.38	4.32	4.30	4.84
5. Did auc	diovisua.	l techniques en	nhance y	our understanding	5	2	0	0	4	9	25	4.55	256/1193	4.55	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.55
		Discus							•									****
				what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/1172			4.15	4.12	
				d to participate	41	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/1182		4.29	4.35	4.30	****
				d open discussion	41	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/1170		4.34	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	essful		41	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
				_			,											
				Frequ	lency	Dis	tribi	ıtıoı	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 14		Red	guire		 วะ M	 aior	g 3	4	Graduat	 _	0	Majo		7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 17		1.0	-10-1-	Ju		w) 0 =		-	OZ dadao	_		11000	-	•
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	l				2	Under-q	rad 4	15	Non-	major	38
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D 0				_				_	011001 9		-	2.021		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F 0		E14	ectiv	7es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
Graa.	J	3.30 1.00	13	P 1		11.1	CCCI	,				_	respons					1
				I 0		O+1	her					1	T CPPOILE		c bran	ıııcaı		
				? 3		001						_						
				: 3														

Anatomy & Physiology I

Title Instructor: Fleischmann, Est

Enrollment: 150 Questionnaires: 81

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 150 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did vou gai	n new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	12	67	4.85	211/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.85
	tructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	25	50	4.57	468/1447		4.28	4.27	4.23	4.57
	m questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	7	28	41	4.34	709/1241		4.26	4.33	4.35	4.34
	valuations reflect the expected goals	2	36	1	1	8	11	22	4.21	818/1402		4.27	4.24	4.24	4.21
	d readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	0	6	23	40	4.44	409/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.44
6. Did written	assignments contribute to what you learned	. 3	47	1	0	3	7	20	4.45	444/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.45
	ding system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	8	12	56	4.60	349/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.60
8. How many ti	mes was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	72	4.92	388/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How would y	ou grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	5	29	33	4.42	442/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.42
	Lecture														
1. Were the in	structor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	5	16	56	4.66	566/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.66
	tructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	74	4.96			4.70	4.73	4.71	4.96
	material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	3	4	20	50	4.52	597/1386		4.28	4.32	4.24	4.52
	tures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	13	60	4.72	379/1380		4.38	4.32	4.30	4.72
5. Did audiovi	sual techniques enhance your understanding	5	18	0	2	5	20	31	4.38	395/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.38
	Discussion														
1. Did class d	iscussions contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	****/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	****
	udents actively encouraged to participate	61	0	0	0	4	4	12		****/1182		4.29	4.35	4.30	****
	tructor encourage fair and open discussion	61	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	****/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	***
	l techniques successful	61	11	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	****/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
	Laboratory														
1. Did the lab	increase understanding of the material	80	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	***
	ovided with adequate background information		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 192		4.68	4.34	4.38	****
	ary materials available for lab activities	80	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 186		4.70	4.48	4.57	****
	instructor provide assistance	80	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	****
	Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Do	ason	a			m	no			Majors	
crearcs marmed	cum. GPA Expected Grades					asul	.a 			Ту	 he			ma jors	
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 2 A 19		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 6	56	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	21
28-55 3	1.00-1.99 0 B 43														

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA	7	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	19	Required for Majors	66	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	43						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	6	С	8	General	1	Under-grad	81	Non-major	60
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 252 01 University of Maryland Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Fleischmann, Est (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 151 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	aner	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	N	IR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this	course	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected of		0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	67/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected	goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	213/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected of	goals	0	4	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	542/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you	u learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	223/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what y	you learned	0	9	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	274/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	52/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching eff	fectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	214/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.34
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	d	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	140/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the su	ubject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	369/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained	d clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	182/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you lear	rned	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	111/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your unde	erstanding	3	4	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	168/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.70
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you	u learned 1	.4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to par	rticipate 1	4	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open of			0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1170		4.34	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	1:	.4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the ma	aterial	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background	information	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab a	activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance		9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	83/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly sp	pecified	9	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	****
	Frequen	су	Dist	ribu	tior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Exped	cted Grades				Rea	sons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
	 A 4 B 8		Rec	quire	d fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	2	Graduate	e e	1	Majo	r	6

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	1	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: BIOL 252 01 University of Maryland

Title Baltimore County Anatomy & Physiol Lab Instructor: (Instr. B) Spring 2010

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 152

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Ω	0	Ω	0	Λ	0	17	5.00	1/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	67/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	213/1241		4.26	4.33	4.35	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	542/1402		4.27	4.24	4.24	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	223/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	274/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	52/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	849/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	83/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	1	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Anatomy & Physiol Lab

Title Instructor: Fleischmann, Est (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 21

Spring 2010

Page 153 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions			NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructo Rai		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera:	 1																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights, ski		this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	298/	1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.76
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	702/	1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.38
		estions reflect	_	_	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	523/	1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.52
	_	ations reflect			0	12	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	196/	1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.78
			_	hat you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	122/		4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.83
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	16	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/	1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	****
		g system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	154/	1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.81
		was class cance	-		1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	485/		4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.90
				ning effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	634/	1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.15
		Lecture	e																
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	s well p	repared	9	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	891/	1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.61
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	the subject	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	707/	1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented	d and ex	plained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	733/	1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.55
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned	9	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	749/	1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.66
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	9	6	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	796/	1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.83
		Discus																	
				hat you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	350/	1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.56
	Were all students actively encouraged to participat Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi				12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	219/	1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.89
	5 - 1				12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	243/		4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.89
4. Were s	4. Were special techniques successful				12	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	318/	800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	4.29
	Laboratory																		
		crease understa			5	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81		189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.81
				round information	5	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81		192		4.68	4.34	4.38	4.81
	_			or lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56		186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.56
		structor provide			5	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88		187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.88
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	5	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/	168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	****
		Field V																	
3. Was th	e instruc	ctor available :	tor cons	sultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	28	****	****	4.52	****	***
		Self 1	Paced																
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ate to w	hat you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did st	udy quest	cions make clear	r the ex	spected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the in	nstructo	or helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was th	e feedbac	ck/tutoring by p	proctors	helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were t	here enou	gh proctors for	r all th	ne students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****
	Fre					Dis	tribu	ution	n										
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	\$				Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1						าแร่ง	 ed fo	or Ma	ior	 g 1		Grad	 duat			Majo		3
	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 12					11.01	-1 CATT (-u -(J 1.10	٠٠_	~ _	. •	JIA	-uu c	_	5	1100	-	5
	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 3					Ger	nera:	1				0	Und	er-g	rad ?	21	Non-	-major	18
	84-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0							_				-	01101	9.		_	2.011		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					Ele	ectiv	ves				1	###:	# - #	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh	
	-		P 0												es to k			_	•
				I O		Other				1	1								
I 0																			

Anatomy & Physiol Lab Course-Section: BIOL 252 02 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Title (Instr. B) Instructor:

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 154

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect 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 5 16 4.76 298/1447 4.85 4.48 4.31 4.31 4.76 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 8 11 4.38 702/1447 4.56 4.28 4.27 4.23 4.38 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 6 13 4.52 523/1241 4.49 4.26 4.33 4.35 4.52 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 12 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 196/1402 4.46 4.27 4.24 4.24 4.78 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 0 0 3 15 4.83 122/1358 4.66 4.09 4.11 4.12 4.83 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 16 0 0 1 3 1 4.00 ****/1316 4.47 4.13 4.14 4.08 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 2 18 4.81 154/1427 4.61 4.22 4.19 4.14 4.81 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 2 18 4.90 485/1447 4.88 4.75 4.69 4.70 4.90 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 3 8 4 4.07 817/1434 4.18 4.03 4.10 3.97 4.15 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9 0 0 0 1 3 8 4.58 684/1387 4.59 4.48 4.46 4.42 4.61 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 859/1387 4.86 4.70 4.73 4.71 4.83 0 2 3 7 4.42 733/1386 4.57 4.28 4.32 4.24 4.55 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 4 8 4.67 463/1380 4.70 4.38 4.32 4.30 4.66 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 7 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 ****/1193 4.18 4.14 4.02 4.04 3.83 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 1 2 6 4.56 350/1172 4.24 4.14 4.15 4.12 4.56 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 219/1182 4.38 4.29 4.35 4.30 4.89 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 243/1170 4.49 4.34 4.38 4.32 4.89 4. Were special techniques successful 12 2 0 0 2 1 4 4.29 318/800 4.29 4.20 4.06 4.01 4.29 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material $$ 5 $$ 0 $$ 0 $$ 3 13 4.81 34/ 189 4.83 4.74 4.34 4.47 4.81 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 1 1 14 4.81 32/ 192 4.77 4.68 4.34 4.38 4.81 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 5 0 0 0 2 3 11 4.56 92/186 4.67 4.70 4.48 4.57 4.56 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5 0 0 0 1 0 15 4.88 23/187 4.77 4.67 4.33 4.46 4.88 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5 11 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 ****/ 168 4.67 4.48 4.20 4.15 **** Field Work 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 20 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.52 **** **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 **** **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 20 0 00 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 **** **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 20 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.64 **** **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 20 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.60 **** **** 20 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.64 **** **** 20 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 15 **** 5.00 4.61 **** **** 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Reasons Majors 00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 12 56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 3 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Required for Majors 16 Graduate Major B 12 C 3 D 0 General 0 Under-grad 21 Non-major 18 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant

Other

1

I 0

2 1

Course-Section: BIOL 252 02 Title

University of Maryland

Anatomy & Physiol Lab Baltimore County (Instr. C) Spring 2010

Enrollment: 22

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 155

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires.	ZI Student Co	urse	Eval	uatı	on Q	uesti	LOIII	laire	:						
					-	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	
	Questions	NR 	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
	new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	298/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.76
	uctor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	702/1447		4.28	4.27	4.23	4.38
	questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52			4.26	4.33	4.35	4.52
	luations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	7	4.78			4.27	4.24	4.24	4.78
_	readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	15		122/1358		4.09	4.11	4.12	4.83
	ssignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	1	3	1		****/1316		4.13	4.14	4.08	****
	ng system clearly explained s was class cancelled	0 1	0	0	0	1 0	2	18 18	4.81			4.22 4.75	4.19 4.69	4.14 4.70	4.81 4.90
-	grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	8			754/1434			4.10		4.15
	Lecture														
1. Were the insti	ructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	337/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.61
	actor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91			4.70	4.73	4.71	4.83
	aterial presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	241/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.55
4. Did the lectur	res contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	10		159/1380		4.38	4.32	4.30	4.66
5. Did audiovisua	al techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.83
	Discussion														
	cussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	350/1172		4.14	4.15	4.12	4.56
	ents actively encouraged to participate	12 12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	219/1182		4.29	4.35	4.30	4.89
	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi					0 2	1 1	8	4.89			4.34	4.38	4.32	4.89 4.29
4. Were special (4. Were special techniques successful						Т	4	4.29	318/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	4.29
1 Did the lah in	Laboratory ncrease understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.81	34/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.81
	ided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	32/ 192		4.68	4.34	4.38	4.81
	y materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2			4.56	- ,			4.48	4.57	
	nstructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	23/ 187		4.67	4.33	4.46	4.88
5. Were requirement	ents for lab reports clearly specified	5	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	****
	Field Work														
3. Was the instru	uctor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
	Self Paced														
	d system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31		5.00	4.72	****	****
	stions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 21		5.00	4.57	****	****
	tacts with the instructor helpful ack/tutoring by proctors helpful	20 20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31 ****/ 20		5.00	4.64 4.60	****	****
	ough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 15		5.00	4.60	****	****
	Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Consider Brown	_													20-1	
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				ке 	asons	3 			Ту	ре 			Majors	
$ \begin{array}{ccc} 00-27 & 0 \\ 28-55 & 1 \end{array} $		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.6	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	3	
56-83 2		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	-major	18	
84-150 4 Grad. 0		E.I	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enono	rh	
								_	respons				_	,==	
	P 0 I 0		Ot	her					1						
	? 1														

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Anatomy & Physiol Lab

Instructor: Fleischmann,Est (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 23

Spring 2010

Page 156 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	22	Student C	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Queberonnaires.	22	beaucife c	JOULDC	BValuacion	Quescionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4 01	054/1447	4 05	4 40	4.31	4.31	4 01
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1 1	0	0 1	0	1	4	17 14	4.81	254/1447 575/1447	4.85 4.56	4.48 4.28	4.31	4.31	4.81 4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	7	10	4.14	855/1241	4.49	4.26	4.27	4.23	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	1	5	6	4.14	787/1402	4.49	4.27	4.33	4.33	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	345/1358	4.66	4.27	4.11	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	519/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.12	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1.3	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	680/1427	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	754/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	983/1434	4.18	4.73	4.10	3.97	3.99
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11		_	U		J	J	3.90	J03/1434	4.10	1.03	4.10	3.71	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	1039/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	859/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	775/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	887/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.00
_,														
Discussion						_			540/4450	4 0 4			4 4 4 4	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	710/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	817/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0 3	1	0	0	2	5 3	4.25	763/1170	4.49		4.38	4.32	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	U	U	U	2	3	4.60	****/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	44/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	76/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	80/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	35/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	6	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	28/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
1. 10 mad degree courd you discuss your evaluations	ᄼᅩ	J	J	J	J	J	_	5.00	, 30			1.50		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Anatomy & Physiol Lab

Title Instructor: Fleischmann, Est (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 156 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-		_	
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

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

Instructor:
Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 22

Spring 2010

Page 157 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	254/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	575/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	7	10	4.14	855/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	787/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	345/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	519/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	680/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19		4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	754/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	807/1434		4.03	4.10		3.99
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		J	Ü	Ü	_	,	3	1.00	007/1131	1.10	1.05	1.10	3.77	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	353/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73		4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	253/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	273/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	652/1193		4.14	4.02		4.00
J. Did addiovibual ecciniques cinimice your understanding	11	3	U	U	2	2	2	1.00	032/11/3	1.10	1.11	1.02	1.01	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	710/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	817/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	763/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	2	3		****/ 800		4.20	4.06	4.01	****
1. Were special techniques successiul	11	3	U	U	U	2	5	4.00	/ 800	1.27	4.20	1.00	T.01	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	44/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	76/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	80/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	35/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	6	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	28/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.67
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	,	O	O	U	O	J	O	1.07	20/ 100	1.07	1.10	1.20	1.13	1.07
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 65		4.50	4.42	4.36	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you rearned	21	U	U	U	U	_	U	1.00	/ 03		4.50	1.12	1.30	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	4.00	4.45	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.43 ****	****
		0	0	0	0	0			,	++++	****		++++	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 30			4.30		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 15			4.60	****	****
J. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	/ 13		3.00	4.UI		

Anatomy & Physiol Lab

(Instr. B)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 22

Title

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 157 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-		-	
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Anatomy & Physiol Lab

Title Instructor:

(Instr. C)

Spring 2010

Page 158

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	254/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	575/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	7	10	4.14	855/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	787/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	345/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	519/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	680/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	754/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	849/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	798/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	784/1387	4.86	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.80	392/1386	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.85
	12	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	420/1380	4.57		4.32	4.24	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	0	0	2	2	2	4.70	652/1193	4.70	4.38 4.14	4.32	4.30	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	U	U	2	4	4	4.00	052/1193	4.10	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	710/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	817/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	763/1170	4.49		4.38	4.32	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	2	3		****/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
		_	-	•	-	_	_		,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	44/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	76/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	80/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	35/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	6	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	28/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.67
Seminar							_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
1. 10 what acgree court you arreads your evaluations	21	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	, 30			1.50		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Anatomy & Physiol Lab Instructor:

(Instr. C)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 22

Title

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 158 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Anatomy & Physiol Lab

Title Instructor: Fleischmann, Est (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 24

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 159 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	-						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	133/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	468/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	345/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	567/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	201/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	608/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	243/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	284/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	353/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	510/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	111/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	11	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	Λ	0	2	1	4	4.13	660/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	856/1182		4.29	4.35	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	763/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	1	1	1	1		****/ 800		4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	39/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	37/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.79
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	66/ 186		4.70	4.48	4.57	4.68
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	68/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.68
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	18	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General		Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 252 04 University of Maryland Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 24 Spring 2010

Page 160

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaner	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General	_				_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	133/1447		4.48	4.31	4.31	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	468/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	345/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	567/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	201/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	1	0	3		****/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	608/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	243/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1024/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1144/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	946/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	927/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	420/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	8	0	0	1	0	1		****/1193		4.14	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	660/1172		4.14	4.15	4.12	4.13
 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 	16	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	856/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	763/1170		4.34	4.38	4.32	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	Ω	0	Ω	4	15	4.79	39/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	37/ 192		4.68	4.34	4.38	4.79
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	66/ 186		4.70	4.48	4.57	4.68
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	68/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.68
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	18	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	****
The state of the s	_		-	•	-	~	-	2.00	, 100					

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	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 Baltimore County

Title Microbiology
Instructor: Sandoz, James W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 178

178

Ouestionnaires: 93

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 161

JUN 28, 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 0 0 2 3 14 22 52 4.28 849/1447 4.52 4.48 4.31 4.31 4.28 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 4 19 34 35 4.05 1023/1447 4.35 4.28 4.27 4.23 4.05 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 2 6 16 31 37 4.03 909/1241 4.36 4.26 4.33 4.35 4.03 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 48 1 2 9 18 15 3.98 1006/1402 4.22 4.27 4.24 4.24 3.98 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 6 2 6 20 24 31 3.92 905/1358 4.11 4.09 4.11 4.12 3.92 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 58 1 1 10 11 9 3.81 962/1316 3.90 4.13 4.14 4.08 3.81 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 1 3 6 11 27 42 4.11 906/1427 4.12 4.22 4.19 4.14 4.11 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 1 0 4 86 4.92 388/1447 4.83 4.75 4.69 4.70 4.92 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 14 1 3 3 24 27 21 3.77 1081/1434 3.89 4.03 4.10 3.97 3.79 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 1 9 24 58 4.51 783/1387 4.53 4.48 4.46 4.42 4.55 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 2 5 19 65 4.62 1042/1387 4.53 4.70 4.73 4.71 4.67 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 2 4 23 27 34 3.97 1079/1386 4.15 4.28 4.32 4.24 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 1 2 15 25 48 4.29 858/1380 4.25 4.38 4.32 4.30 4.32 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 5 2 4 14 26 38 4.12 602/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.04 4.17 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 69 0 3 7 3.67 925/1172 4.01 4.14 4.15 4.12 3.67 6 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 69 4 6 8 3.63 1047/1182 4.03 4.29 4.35 4.30 3.63 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 69 0 1 1 9 6 7 3.71 1001/1170 4.08 4.34 4.38 4.32 3.71 4. Were special techniques successful 69 15 0 3 0 2 4 3.78 ****/ 800 3.91 4.20 4.06 4.01 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 4.70 ****/ 189 4.76 4.74 4.34 4.47 **** 0 2 3 5 4.30 ****/ 192 4.56 4.68 4.34 4.38 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 83 0 0 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 84 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 ****/ 186 4.72 4.70 4.48 4.57 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 83 0 0 0 1 1 8 4.70 ****/ 187 4.62 4.67 4.33 4.46 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 83 0 0 0 3 2 5 4.20 ****/ 168 4.45 4.48 4.20 4.15 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 0 3.00 ****/ 66 **** 4.00 4.58 4.43 **** 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 62 **** 4.00 4.56 4.28 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 92 0 0 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 92 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.50 4.41 3.79 **** 0 92 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.50 4.42 4.36 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 92 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.50 4.09 3.70 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 92 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.49 2.25 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 92 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.00 4.25 3.25 92 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.52 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 92 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.30 **** 92 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 27 *** *** 4.43 *** **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 92 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 92 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 **** ****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 92 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.64 **** ****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 92 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.60 **** ****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 92 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 15 **** 5.00 4.61 **** ****

Course-Section: BIOL 275 01 University of Maryland Page 161 Title Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Microbiology

Instructor: Sandoz, James W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 178 Questionnaires: 93

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	 А	18	Required for Majors	63	 Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	32						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	9	С	23	General	1	Under-grad	93	Non-major	71
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	13	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	2						

Title Microbiology

Instructor: Enrollment: 178 Questionnaires: 93 (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 162

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncie	es 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
~ 1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	14	22	52	4.28	849/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	19	34	35		1023/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	6	16	31	37	4.03	909/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	48	1	2	9	18	15		1006/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.24	3.98
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	2	6	20	24	31	3.92	905/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	58	1	1	10	11	9	3.81	962/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	6	11	27	42	4.11	906/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	4	86	4.92	388/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	2	4	20	25	20	3.80	1052/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	0	6	18	56	4.58	684/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	1	0	2	14	62	4.72	904/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	2	8	11	22	36	4.04	1034/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	3	12	18	45	4.35	807/1380	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	3	1	3	10	25	36	4.23	501/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	69	0	1	3	6	7	7	3.67	925/1172	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.12	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	69	0	1	5	4	6	8	3.63	1047/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	69	0	1	1	9	6	7		1001/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	69	15	0	3	0	2	4	3.78	****/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	83	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	****/ 189	4.76	4.74	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	83	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	****/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	84	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	****/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	83	0	0	0	1	1	8		****/ 187	4.62	4.67	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	83	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	****/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	92	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	92	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	92	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	92	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	92	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	92	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	***	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275 01 Title

Microbiology

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 162 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Enrollment: 178 Questionnaires: 93

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	 А	18	Required for Majors	63	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В	32						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	9	C	23	General		Under-grad	93	Non-major	71
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	13	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	2						

Microbiology Laborator

Title Sandoz, James W

Instructor:

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 163 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57			4.48	4.31	4.31	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	648/1447		4.28	4.27	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	766/1241		4.26	4.33	4.35	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	11				4.27		4.24	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	5	7	4		1043/1358		4.09	4.11	4.12	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	8	6	4	3.68	1038/1316		4.13	4.14	4.08	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	1077/1427		4.22	4.19	4.14	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	754/1447		4.75	4.69	4.70	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	341/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	566/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	14		1042/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	10	8	4.19			4.70	4.32	4.71	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.19			4.28	4.32	4.24	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	5	8	5	3.84	791/1193		4.14			3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	Τ	U	Э	8	Э	3.84	/91/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	710/1172	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	952/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	864/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	87/ 189		4.74	4.34	4.47	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31			4.68	4.34	4.38	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0		14	4.88	28/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	92/ 187		4.67	4.33	4.46	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	75/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.31
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5 00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	4		,	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/ 64		3.50	4.09	3.70	****
3. Were differing for grading made ordar	10	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	3.00	, 01		3.30	1.05	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	***	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced					_		_					4 50		
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	,	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1			****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1			****	5.00	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Title Microbiology Laborator

Instructor: Sandoz, James W

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 163 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

University of Maryland tor Baltimore County

Microbiology Laborator ctor: Sandoz,James W (Instr. A)

Instructor: Sand Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 18

Title

Spring 2010

Page 164 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

			Fre	anıer	ncies			Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	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	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	463/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	702/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	646/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	900/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	485/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	748/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	866/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	673/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	817/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.96
Tarkuna														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	0	3	1 =	1 02	207/1207	/ E2	1 10	1 16	1 12	4.73
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		0	0			2	15	4.83	307/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	-	0	0 1	8	16	4.89	579/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0 1	2	5		4.44	691/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	8	5	4.33	815/1380 388/1193	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.26 4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	Э	U	U	U	8	Э	4.38	388/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	218/1172	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	430/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	480/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	308/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	4.30
T all assat assa														
Laboratory	_	0	0	0	1	^	_	4 60	E0 / 100	4 76	4 74	4 24	4 45	4 67
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1 0	2	9	4.67	58/ 189	4.76		4.34	4.47	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1 1	0	1 2	10 9	4.67	59/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6 6	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.58 4.67	88/ 186	4.72 4.62	4.70 4.67	4.48	4.57	4.58 4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.67	73/ 187 62/ 168	4.62	4.67	4.33	$4.46 \\ 4.15$	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	U	U	1	1	2	0	4.42	02/ 100	4.45	4.40	4.20	4.15	4.42
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
		-	-	-	-	-			,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	***

Microbiology Laborator

Title Instructor: Sandoz, James W (Instr. A) University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 164 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-		_	
				?	0						

Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title Microbiology Laborator

Instructor: (Instr. B) Enrollment:

21

Page 165 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA 	Fr 1	equei 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	463/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	702/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	646/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	900/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	485/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	748/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	866/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	673/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1024/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	611/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1218/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	863/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	946/1380	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	574/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	218/1172	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	430/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	480/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	308/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	58/ 189	4.76	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	59/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	88/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.58
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	73/ 187	4.62	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	62/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.42
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Questionnaires: 18

Microbiology Laborator

Title

Instructor: Enrollment: 21

(Instr. B)

Page 165 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2010

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	Graduate 0		8		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	12								
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10		
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	#### - Means there are				
				P	0			responses to be significant					
				I	0	Other	2	-		-			
				?	0								

University of Maryland
Laborator Baltimore County

Microbiology Laborator Baltimore Count Sandoz, James W (Instr. A) Spring 2010

Instructor: Sand Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 17

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 166 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies			Inst	Instructor		Dept	t 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	8	8	4.41	709/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	741/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	646/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	845/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	893/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	2	6	3	3.77	991/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	971/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	836/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	969/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3		4.56	712/1387		4.48	4.46	4.42	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	958/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	979/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	877/1380	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1022/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	881/1172		4.14	4.15	4.12	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	817/1182		4.29	4.35	4.30	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	951/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	537/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	3.86
T all area harre														
Laboratory	_	0	0	0	-	-	•	4 50	40 / 100	4 56	4 54	4 2 4	4 45	4 50
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	49/ 189	4.76	4.74		4.47	4.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	116/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	58/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	94/ 187	4.62	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	73/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	,	****	4.00		4.43	****
	15	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/ 58	****		4.56		****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 64	****	4.50	4.42	4.36 3.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	U	U	U	U	Т	1	4.50	***/ 64		3.50	4.09	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.43	****	****
J. Did contelences help you carry out freid accivities	10	U	U	U	U	т	U	4.00	/ 2/			4.43		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00		****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****
1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	-	-	-	-	-		-		,			· · -		

Microbiology Laborator

Title Instructor: Sandoz, James W (Instr. A) University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 166 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	3		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14		
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	are not enough	ı			
				P	0			responses to be significant					
				I	0	Other	0	_					
				?	0								

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Title Microbiology Laborator

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 167

JUN 28, 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 0 0 0 1 8 8 4.41 709/1447 4.52 4.48 4.31 4.31 4.41 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 5 9 4.35 741/1447 4.35 4.28 4.27 4.23 4.35 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 4 10 4.41 646/1241 4.36 4.26 4.33 4.35 4.41 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 3 4 9 4.18 845/1402 4.22 4.27 4.24 4.24 4.18 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2 1 1 3 2 7 3.93 893/1358 4.11 4.09 4.11 4.12 3.93 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 3 0 2 2 6 3 3.77 991/1316 3.90 4.13 4.14 4.08 3.77 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 2 2 6 6 4.00 971/1427 4.12 4.22 4.19 4.14 4.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 2 13 4.75 836/1447 4.83 4.75 4.69 4.70 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0 0 5 2 0 3.29 1305/1434 3.89 4.03 4.10 3.97 3.60 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 10 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 1015/1387 4.53 4.48 4.46 4.42 4.42 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 10 0 0 2 2 3 4.14 1293/1387 4.53 4.70 4.73 4.71 4.42 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11 0 0 1 1 1 3 4.00 1047/1386 4.15 4.28 4.32 4.24 4.07 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 739/1380 4.25 4.38 4.32 4.30 4.35 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 3 1 0 1 1 1 3.25 ****/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.04 3.33 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 1 3 3.75 881/1172 4.01 4.14 4.15 4.12 3.75 1 4 4.13 817/1182 4.03 4.29 4.35 4.30 4.13 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 2 2 3 3.88 951/1170 4.08 4.34 4.38 4.32 3.88 4. Were special techniques successful 9 1 0 2 0 2 3 3.86 537/800 3.91 4.20 4.06 4.01 3.86 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 6 0 0 9 4.73 49/ 189 4.76 4.74 4.34 4.47 4.73 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 6 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 116/192 4.56 4.68 4.34 4.38 4.36 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 6 0 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 58/186 4.72 4.70 4.48 4.57 4.73 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 6 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 94/ 187 4.62 4.67 4.33 4.46 4.55 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 6 2 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 73/168 4.45 4.48 4.20 4.15 4.33 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 66 **** 4.00 4.58 4.43 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 15 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 62 **** 4.00 4.56 4.28 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.50 4.41 3.79 **** 0 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 **** 65 **** 4.50 4.42 4.36 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 64 **** 3.50 4.09 3.70 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.49 2.25 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.00 4.25 3.25 3. Was the instructor available for consultation $16 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 4.00 \quad **** \quad 28 \quad **** \quad 4.52 \quad ****$ 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations $16 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 4.00 \quad **** \quad 30 \quad **** \quad 4.30 \quad ****$ 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 27 **** **** 4.43 **** **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 00 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 **** **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 16 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 **** ****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 16 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.64 **** ****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 16 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.60 **** ****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 16 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 15 **** 5.00 4.61 **** ****

Microbiology Laborator

Title Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 20 Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 167 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title Microbiology Laborator Instructor: Sandoz,James W (Instr. A)

Instructor: Sando Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 17 Spring 2010

Page 168 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Cour	se Evaluation	Questionnaire
--------------	---------------	---------------

			Fre	Frequencies			Tnat	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC	T.evel	Sect	
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«»«»»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	309/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	468/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	427/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	425/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	452/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	812/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	704/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	727/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	712/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	596/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	1006/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	539/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	858/1380	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	759/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	812/1172	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.12	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	3	1	4		1005/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	845/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	637/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	3.57
T abauat aug														
Laboratory	0	0	_	•	0	_	_	F 00	1 / 100	4 56	4 54	4 24	4 45	F 00
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 189	4.76	4.74		4.47	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	39/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	48/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8 8	0	0	0	1 1	1 1	7 7	4.67	73/ 187	4.62	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	U	U	U	Т	Т	/	4.67	28/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
J. Well directia for grading made offer	10	0	Ü	Ü	O	Ü	_	3.00	, 01		3.30	1.05	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275 05

Microbiology Laborator

Title Instructor: Sandoz, James W (Instr. A) University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 168 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title Microbiology Laborator Instructor: (Instr. B)

Instructor:
Enrollment: 19
Ouestionnaires: 17

Spring 2010

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 169 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Instructor							
				_					tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Geneval.														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	309/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.75	468/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	427/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	425/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24		4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	452/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	812/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	704/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	727/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	6	0		1188/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	3	5	4 02	1150/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	4	3	5		1306/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	4	3	4		1191/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	6	3		1096/1380	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	2	0	4	1	2		1072/1193			4.02		3.51
Discussion		_			_									
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	812/1172		4.14	4.15	4.12	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	3	1	4		1005/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	845/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	637/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	3.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 189	4.76	4.74	4.34	4.47	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	39/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	48/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	73/ 187	4.62	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	28/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.67
Qomi non														
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
									,					
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275 05

Microbiology Laborator

Title Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 169 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: BIOL 295 1
Title Bioinformatics Intro University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Erill Sagales, I (Instr. A) Instructor:

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor

Page 170

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 1 1 9 10 8 3.79 1241/1447 3.79 4.48 4.31 4.31 3.79 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 4 13 9 2 3.24 1373/1447 3.24 4.28 4.27 4.23 3.24 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4 10 12 3 3.48 1147/1241 3.48 4.26 4.33 4.35 3.48 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 5 15 5 3 3.21 1340/1402 3.21 4.27 4.24 4.24 3.21 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 17 3 4 4 1 0 2.25 1346/1358 2.25 4.09 4.11 4.12 2.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6 2 2 6 10 3 3.43 1160/1316 3.43 4.13 4.14 4.08 3.43 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 3 7 13 2 4 2.90 1368/1427 2.90 4.22 4.19 4.14 2.90 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 29 5.00 1/1447 5.00 4.75 4.69 4.70 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 29 5.00 1/1447 5.00 4.75 4.69 4.70 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $$ 5 $$ 0 $$ 2 $$ 10 $$ 2 $$ 3.50 $$ 1238/1434 $$ 3.60 $$ 4.03 $$ 4.10 $$ 3.97 $$ 3.60 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 4 7 17 4.38 931/1387 4.34 4.48 4.46 4.42 4.34 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 2 3 5 19 4.41 1197/1387 4.63 4.70 4.73 4.71 4.63 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 1 4 15 7 1 3.11 1323/1386 3.36 4.28 4.32 4.24 3.36 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 3 2 6 9 8 3.61 1218/1380 3.73 4.38 4.32 4.30 3.73 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 4 0 1 7 4 10 4.05 636/1193 3.95 4.14 4.02 4.04 3.95 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 2 3 2 3.63 947/1172 3.63 4.14 4.15 4.12 3.63 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 21 0 0 0 3 5 0 3.63 1047/1182 3.63 4.29 4.35 4.30 3.63 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 22 0 0 0 5 1 1 3.43 ****/1170 **** 4.34 4.38 4.32 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 21 4 1 0 3 0 0 2.50 **** / 800 **** 4.20 4.06 4.01 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 27 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 **** 189 **** 4.74 4.34 4.47 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 27 0 0 2 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 192 **** 4.68 4.34 4.38 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 186 **** 4.70 4.48 4.57 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 168 **** 4.48 4.20 4.15 **** Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 28 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.50 4.09 3.70 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.49 2.25 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 28 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.00 4.25 3.25 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 28 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** / 30 **** 4.30 **** **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 28 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 **** **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 28 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 **** **** 28 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.64 **** **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons
 00-27
 2
 0.00-0.99
 0
 A
 4

 28-55
 1
 1.00-1.99
 0
 B
 10

 56-83
 2
 2.00-2.99
 0
 C
 7

 84-150
 8
 3.00-3.49
 6
 D
 1

 Grad.
 0
 3.50-4.00
 10
 F
 0
 Required for Majors 9 Graduate 0 Major 5 Under-grad 29 Non-major 24 General 4 F 0 Electives #### - Means there are not enough 9 P 0 responses to be significant Other

? 6

Course-Section: BIOL 295 1 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Title Bioinformatics Intro Ba Instructor: Kann, Maricel Ga (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 50
Questionnaires: 29

 ryland
 Page 171

 tty
 JUN 28, 2010

 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Fvaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Overtions	NID	3.7.7	Fr 1	_	ncie	:s 4	5		tructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR 	NA				4		Mean	Rank 	mean	Mean	mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	9	10	8	3.79	1241/1447	3.79	4.48	4.31	4.31	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	13	9	2	3.24	1373/1447	3.24	4.28	4.27	4.23	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	10	12	3	3.48	1147/1241	3.48	4.26	4.33	4.35	3.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	5	15	5	3	3.21	1340/1402	3.21	4.27	4.24	4.24	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	3	4	4	1	0	2.25	1346/1358	2.25	4.09	4.11	4.12	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne		6	2	2	6	10	3	3.43	1160/1316	3.43	4.13	4.14	4.08	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	7	13	2	4		1368/1427		4.22	4.19	4.14	2.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1447		4.75	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 5	0	0	0	9	13	2	3.71	1125/1434	3.60	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	8	14	4.30	1007/1387	4.34	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	23		681/1387		4.70	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	10	7	6		1234/1386		4.28	4.32	4.24	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	4	10	9		1133/1380			4.32		3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	1	7	6	6	3.85	786/1193	3.95	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	947/1172	3.63	4.14	4.15	4.12	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	3	5	0		1047/1182		4.29	4.35	4.30	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	5	1	1		****/1170		4.34	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 800	***	4.20	4.06	4.01	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	4.74	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background informatio		0	0	2	0	0	0		****/ 192	****	4.68	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	4.70	4.48	4.57	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	***	4.48	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	***	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 36		4.00	4.25	3.25	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations			0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30		****	4.30	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,			4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			0	0	1	0	0		****/ 31		5.00	4.64	****	****
	28	-	-	-	•	-	-		,			· · ·		

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Ą	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	5	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	24	
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	4	_				

? 6

University of Maryland Course-Section: BIOL 301 01 Title Ecology & Evolution

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Mendelson, Tamra (Instr. A) Enrollment: 254

Questionnaires: 102

Page 172 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student.	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Deddelle	COULDC	DVATAACIOII	Queberonnarie

			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	4	8	34	54	4.35	781/1447		4.48	4.31	4.32	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	4	10	37	48	4.30	805/1447	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	4	18	34	42	4.13	861/1241	4.13	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	43	0	6	8	18	25	4.09	923/1402		4.27	4.24	4.24	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	8	13	8	19	26	22		1212/1358	3.41	4.09	4.11	4.10	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	46	3	4	11	14	18	3.80	968/1316	3.80	4.13	4.14	4.13	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	3	1	11	25	57	4.36	644/1427	4.36	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	0	1	22	72	4.71	918/1447	4.71	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	37	0	0	0	7	36	22	4.23	657/1434	4.14	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	1	2	9	62	4.78	383/1387	4.67	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	1	1	8	65	4.83	732/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	2	2	19	51	4.61	510/1386	4.50	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	2	2	14	55	4.67	448/1380	4.61	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	2	1	1	6	13	47	4.53	275/1193	4.45	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	2	2	4	9	18	4.11	666/1172		4.14	4.15	4.24	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	2	2	5	5	21	4.17	781/1182	4.17	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	67	0	1	1	1	7	25	4.54	554/1170	4.54	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	67	6	0	2	8	5	14	4.07	413/ 800	4.07	4.20	4.06	4.12	4.07
Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ıtio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Ą	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	67	Graduate	0	Major	61
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	В	44						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	102	Non-major	41
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	24	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	5						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 01 University of Maryland Title Ecology & Evolution Baltimore County

Instructor: Leips, Jeffery W (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 254
Questionnaires: 102

Spring 2010
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 173 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eaue	ncie	s	Instructor		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	1	4	8	34	54	4.35	781/1447	4.35	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	4	10	37	48	4.30	805/1447	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	4	18	34	42	4.13	861/1241	4.13	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	43	0	6	8	18	25	4.09	923/1402	4.09	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	8	13	8	19	26	22	3.41	1212/1358	3.41	4.09	4.11	4.10	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	46	3	4	11	14	18	3.80	968/1316	3.80	4.13	4.14	4.13	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	3	1	11	25	57	4.36	644/1427	4.36	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	0	1	22	72	4.71	918/1447	4.71	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	0	0	2	7	38	24	4.18	712/1434	4.14	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	1	5	11	57	4.68	551/1387	4.67	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	0	0	1	7	65	4.88	604/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	3	1	24	46	4.53	587/1386	4.50	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	1	4	17	50	4.56	593/1380	4.61	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	2	0	1	5	21	43	4.51	281/1193	4.45	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	2	2	4	q	18	4.11	666/1172	4.11	4.14	4.15	4.24	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	2	2	5	5	21	4.17	781/1182	4.17	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	67	0	1	1	1	7	25	4.54	554/1170	4.54	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	67	6	0	2	8	5	14	4.07	413/ 800	4.07	4.20	4.06	4.12	4.07
Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Ą	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	А	24	Required for Majors	67	Graduate	0	Major	61
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	В	44						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	102	Non-major	41
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	24	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				?	5						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 01 University

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Title Ecology & Evolution
Instructor: Omland, Kevin E (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 254
Questionnaires: 102

Page 174 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			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	4	8	34	54	4.35	781/1447	4.35	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	4	10	37	48	4.30	805/1447	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	4	18	34	42	4.13	861/1241	4.13	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	43	0	6	8	18	25	4.09	923/1402	4.09	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	8	13	8	19	26	22	3.41	1212/1358	3.41	4.09	4.11	4.10	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	46	3	4	11	14	18	3.80	968/1316	3.80	4.13	4.14	4.13	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	3	1	11	25	57	4.36	644/1427	4.36	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	0	1	22	72	4.71	918/1447	4.71	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	52	0	1	2	8	23	16	4.02	838/1434	4.14	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	48	0	0	2	5	9	38	4.54	755/1387	4.67	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	48	0	0	0	1	4	49	4.89	579/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	48	0	0	3	6	13	32	4.37	775/1386	4.50	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	1	2	15	36	4.59	560/1380	4.61	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	48	8	0	2	9	8	27	4.30	440/1193	4.45	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	2	2	4	9	18	4.11	666/1172	4.11	4.14	4.15	4.24	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	2	2	5	5	21	4.17	781/1182	4.17	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	67	0	1	1	1	7	25	4.54	554/1170	4.54	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	67	6	0	2	8	5	14	4.07	413/ 800	4.07	4.20	4.06	4.12	4.07

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	67	Graduate	0	Major	61
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	В	44						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	102	Non-major	41
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	24	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means	s there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				?	5						

Course-Section: BIOL 302 01

Molec & General Geneti

Instructor: Eisenmann, David

Enrollment: 211
Questionnaires: 115

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 175 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluat	ion Questionnaire
------------------------	-------------------

			Fre	eque	ncie	es		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	4	0	0	1	6	27	77	4.62	452/1447	4.34	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	9	32	69	4.52	510/1447		4.28	4.27	4.23	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	4	18	27	63	4.33	717/1241	4.26	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	35	0	1	12	21	43	4.38	645/1402		4.27	4.24	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	6	6	9	33	51	4.11	736/1358		4.09	4.11	4.10	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	44	0	3	10	18	36	4.30	581/1316		4.13	4.14	4.13	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	3	1	2	12	19	74	4.51	,		4.22	4.19	4.15	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	1	0	1	7	99	4.88	565/1447		4.75	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	2	1	0	6	41	37	4.33	553/1434		4.03	4.10		4.33
. 3														
Lecture	_	•	•	_					455 /4005	4 50				4 50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	4	19	84	4.72	475/1387		4.48	4.46	4.44	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0		102	4.93	422/1387		4.70	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	6	26	76	4.65	457/1386		4.28	4.32	4.30	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	1	5	15	85	4.74	366/1380		4.38	4.32	4.32	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	11	24	70	4.56	249/1193	4.31	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	78	0	5	1	8	5	18	3.81	853/1172	3.95	4.14	4.15	4.24	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	77	0	4	3	7	9	15		1017/1182		4.29	4.35	4.42	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	77	0	3	0	4	13	18	4.13	833/1170		4.34	4.38	4.49	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	78	22	3	1	1	3	7		****/ 800		4.20	4.06	4.12	****
•														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	112	2	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 189		4.74	4.34	4.26	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	114	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	4.38	4.68	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	113	1	0	0	0	Λ	1	5 00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	114	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 62		4.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	114	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58		4.50	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	114	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65		4.50	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	114	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 64		3.50	4.09	3.38	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	114	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 64		3.50	4.09	3.30	
Freq	uency	Dist	trib	utic	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 39 28-55 19 1.00-1.99 0 B 36		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ſajor	s 8	16	Graduat	e	1	Majo	r	54

Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	39	Required for Majors	86	Graduate	1	Major	54
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	0	В	36						
56-83	22	2.00-2.99	12	C	17	General	2	Under-grad	114	Non-major	61
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	s there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 302 01

Title Mol & Gen Genetics Lab

Instructor: Caruso, Steven M

Enrollment: 193
Questionnaires: 173

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2010

Page 176 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	4	7	34	56	69	4.05	1032/1447	4.34	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	11	30	48	79	4.14	956/1447	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	11	23	51	83	4.19	833/1241	4.26	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	5	6	7	38	52	61		1036/1402	4.16	4.27	4.24	4.24	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	11	6	12	33	45	61	3.91	905/1358	4.01	4.09	4.11	4.10	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	6	12	42	50	57	3.84		4.07	4.13	4.14	4.13	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	6	13	22	49	78	4.07		4.29	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	0		156	4.93	388/1447	4.90	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	39	2	1	1	18	69	43	4.15	744/1434	4.24	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	6	21	129	4.72	475/1387	4.72	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	2	8		127	4.69	946/1387	4.81	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	6	19	44	97	4.40	757/1386	4.52	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	3	17	44	95	4.33	823/1380	4.53	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	18	8	5	25	38	67	4.06	,	4.31		4.02	4.05	4.06
5. Did dudiovipudi ecciniques emanee jour understanding			Ü	,	23	50	0 /	1.00	032/11/3	1.31		1.02	1.03	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	118	0	4	0	12	10	29	4.09	675/1172	3.95	4.14	4.15	4.24	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	120	0	6	1	7	9	30	4.06	844/1182	3.90	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	120	0	5	0	8	12	28	4.09	852/1170	4.11	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	121	24	3	2	12	4	7	3.36	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	****
- 1														
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	0	2	3	15	32	67	4.34	-,	4.34	4.74	4.34	4.26	4.34
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	1	12	44	62	4.38	114/ 192	4.38	4.68	4.34	4.20	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	0	1	5	8	23	82	4.51			4.70	4.48	4.36	4.51
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	1 0	2	9	9	25	73		114/ 187	4.34	4.67	4.33	4.11	4.34
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	U	4	14	20	30	53	3.94	120/ 168	3.94	4.48	4.20	4.02	3.94
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	169	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	169	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	169	1	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	169	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	169	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	169	0	1	0	1	1	1		****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	170	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	170	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	171	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	171	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Calf Darad														
Self Paced	171	0	^	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 21	****	E 00	4 70	E 00	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	171 171	0	0	0	0	1	1 1		****/ 31 ****/ 21	****	5.00 5.00	4.72 4.57	5.00 5.00	****
		0		0	0	1			****/ 31	****				****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	171 171	0	0	0	0	1	1 1		****/ 20	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	171	0	0	0	0	1	_		****/ 15	****	5.00 5.00	4.60 4.61	5.00 5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	Т/Т	U	U	U	U		Т	4.50	/ 15		5.00	4.01	5.00	

Course-Section: BIOL 302 01

Title Mol & Gen Genetics Lab

Instructor: Caruso, Steven M

Enrollment: 193
Questionnaires: 173

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 176 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons	1	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А	58	Required for Ma	jors 131	Graduate	0	Major	85
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	63						
56-83	33	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	173	Non-major	88
84-150	53	3.00-3.49	35	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	43	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	-		
				?	11						

Course-Section: BIOL 303 01 Title

Cell Biology

Craig, Nessly C (Instr. A) Instructor:

Enrollment: 232 Questionnaires: 106

Baltimore County Spring 2010

University of Maryland

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 177

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	5	14	39	45	4.14	971/1447	4.14	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	5	35	35	25		1262/1447	3.67	4.28	4.27	4.23	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	14	27	35	24	3.56	1126/1241	3.56	4.26	4.33	4.33	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	79	2	2	8	9	5	3.50	****/1402	****	4.27	4.24	4.24	***
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	12	7	27	22	30	3.52	1161/1358	3.52	4.09	4.11	4.10	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	87	2	5	5	1	3	2.88	****/1316	****	4.13	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	2	4	7	17	31	41	3.98	992/1427	3.98	4.22	4.19	4.15	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	1	0	0	4	95	4.92		4.92	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	2	5	38	38	10	3.53	1228/1434	3.50	4.03	4.10	4.09	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	13	23	63	4.40			4.48	4.46	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	3	9	20	71		1107/1387	4.61	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	7	24	33	33		1160/1386	3.88	4.28	4.32	4.30	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0 6	5	8	18	30	40		1096/1380	3.97	4.38	4.32	4.32	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	5	11	17	26	32	3.76	843/1193	3.92	4.14	4.02	4.05	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	75	0	4	5	2	4	16	3.74	886/1172	3.74	4.14	4.15	4.24	3.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	78	0	5	1	4	8	10	3.61	1053/1182	3.61	4.29	4.35	4.42	3.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	78	0	8	2	4	4	10		1122/1170	3.21	4.34	4.38	4.49	3.21
4. Were special techniques successful	78	19	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	103	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.74	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	104	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	4.68	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	104	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.70	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	4.67	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.48	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	103	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	104	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	104	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	104	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00		****	4.50	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	103	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	103	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	103	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	103	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	103	0	1	0	0	2	0		****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	104	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	104	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	, -	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	103	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 20	***	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	104	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 303 01 Title Cell Biology Baltimore County Spring 2010

University of Maryland Page 177 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Craig, Nessly C (Instr. A) Enrollment: 232

Questionnaires: 106

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	ors	
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	42	Required for Majors	87	 Graduate	0	Major	48	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	29							
56-83	29	2.00-2.99	8	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	106	Non-major	58	
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	22	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	37	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	h	
				P	0			responses t	o be si	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	3	-				
				2	6							

Course-Section: BIOL 303 01 Title

Cell Biology

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Blumberg, Daphne (Instr. B)

232 Questionnaires: 106

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 178 Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
a1														
General	1	0	2	5	1 /	39	45	1 1 1	071/1/17	1 11	4.48	4.31	4.32	1 11
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	∠ 5	5 5	14 35	35	25		971/1447 1262/1447		4.48	4.31	4.32	4.14 3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	14	35 27	35	24		1126/1241	3.56	4.26	4.27	4.23	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	79	2	2	8	9	5		****/1402		4.27	4.33	4.33	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	12	7	27	22	30		1161/1358		4.09	4.11	4.10	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	87	2	5	5	1	3		****/1316	****	4.13	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	2	4	7	17	31	41	3.98	992/1427		4.22	4.19	4.15	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	1	0	0	4	95	4.92	388/1447		4.75	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	2	9	36	34			1253/1434		4.03	4.10	4.09	3.50
Lecture									000/40=					4 40
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	3	12	24	56	4.40	902/1387		4.48	4.46	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	5	19	71	4.67	982/1387	4.61	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	3	5	20	35	32		1111/1386		4.28	4.32	4.30	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	7 5	13	30	41		1023/1380		4.38	4.32	4.32	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	2	3	5	13	28	39	4.08	624/1193	3.92	4.14	4.02	4.05	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	75	0	4	5	2	4	16	3.74	886/1172	3.74	4.14	4.15	4.24	3.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	78	0	5	1	4	8	10	3.61	1053/1182	3.61	4.29	4.35	4.42	3.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	78	0	8	2	4	4	10	3.21	1122/1170	3.21	4.34	4.38	4.49	3.21
4. Were special techniques successful	78	19	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	103	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 189	****	4.74	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	1	0	1	0	0		****/ 192		4.68	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	104	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 186	****	4.70	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	104	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 187	****	4.67	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.48	4.20	4.02	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	103	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	104	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	***	3.50	4.09	3.38	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	103	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	103	0	1	0	1	1	0		****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	103	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	103	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	103	0	1	0	0	2	0	3 00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	103	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 21	****	5.00	4.72	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	104	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	104	1	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	104	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 15		5.00	4.61	5.00	****
									,					

Course-Section: BIOL 303 01 Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Cell Biology

Instructor: Blumberg, Daphne (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 232 Questionnaires: 106

Spring 2010

Page 178 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	42	Required for Majors	87	Graduate	0	Major	48
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	29						
56-83	29	2.00-2.99	8	С	15	General	0	Under-grad 10	06	Non-major	58
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	22	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	37	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	here	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to b	oe sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_	_		
				?	6						

Course-Section: BIOL 304 01 Title

Plant Biology Lab Mackay, Andrew B

Instructor: Enrollment: 111

Questionnaires: 73

Spring 2010

Page 179 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	-	ncie	es 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	0	1	28	40	4.51	573/1447	4.51	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	0	1	14	49	4.69	315/1447	4.69	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	6	20	38	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	4	18	43	4.56	425/1402	4.56	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	12	15	37	4.35	507/1358	4.35	4.09	4.11	4.10	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	10	15	38	4.39	504/1316	4.39	4.13	4.14	4.13	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	1	1	1	3	17	40	4.52	446/1427	4.52	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	5	58	4.92	388/1447	4.92	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	0	21	44	4.68	222/1434	4.68	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	0	2	54	4.89	215/1387	4.89	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	6	51	4.89	553/1387	4.89	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	1	0	13	43	4.72	366/1386	4.72	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	14	43	4.69	434/1380	4.69	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	16	1	1	10	9	16	4.03	644/1193	4.03	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	****/1172	****	4.14	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	59	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	****/1182	****	4.29	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	60	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	****/1170	****	4.34	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	60	3	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	****/ 800	***	4.20	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	1	13	16	4.50	87/ 189	4.50	4.74	4.34	4.26	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	29/ 192	4.83	4.68	4.34	4.20	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	1	1	6	22	4.63	78/ 186	4.63	4.70	4.48	4.36	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	1	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	33/ 187	4.83	4.67	4.33	4.11	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	1	3	5	21	4.53	44/ 168	4.53	4.48	4.20	4.02	4.53
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	72	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	72	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	72 72	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30 ****/ 27	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 27	^^^*	^ ^ ^ *	4.43	4.50	* * * * *
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	utio	n									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	44	Graduate	0	Major	42
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	27						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	73	Non-major	31
84-150	21	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	4						

Course-Section: BIOL 305 01 University of Maryland Title Comp. Animal Physiolog

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Lin, Weihong (Instr. A) Enrollment: 261

Questionnaires: 100

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 180 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 110	aain n	Genera ew insights,ski		m this source	8	0	1	0	10	32	49	4.39	732/1447	4.49	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.39
		ew insignis,ski ctor make cleai			8	0	1	2	17	3 <i>4</i>	36	4.13	965/1447	4.49	4.48	4.27	4.23	4.39
		uestions reflec		_	8	0	1	4	17	34	36	4.13	887/1241	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.13
	_	uations reflect		_	8	51	2	1	± / 5	14	19	4.15	873/1402	4.23	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.15
				what you learned	9	3	3	4	18	25	38	4.13	783/1358	4.23	4.09	4.11	4.10	4.13
	-	-		o what you learned	9	70	4	2	7	1	7		****/1316	4.04	4.13	4.14	4.13	****
		g system clear!		-	9	0	1	1	10	22	57	4.46	513/1427	4.47	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.46
	-	was class can		illea	10	1	0	0	2	4	83	4.91	,	4.93	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.91
	-			hing effectiveness	16	2	7	14	36	24	1		1358/1434		4.03	4.10	4.09	3.65
J. 110W WO	ould you	grade the over	iii ccac	iiiig circetiveness	10	2	,		30	21	_	2.70	1330/1131	3.00	1.05	1.10	1.05	3.03
		Lectur	re															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	10	0	2	2	10	22	54	4.38	931/1387	4.65	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.55
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	rested i	n the subject	10	0	1	1	9	19	60	4.51	1134/1387	4.70	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.66
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	ed and e	xplained clearly	11	0	13	11	31	13	21	3.20	1306/1386	4.13	4.28	4.32	4.30	3.89
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	11	0	11	8	19	22	29	3.56	1229/1380	4.23	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.02
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques er	nhance y	our understanding	13	10	5	2	17	18	35	3.99	673/1193	4.31	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.16
		Discus																
				what you learned	85	0	1	2	3	3	6		****/1172		4.14		4.24	****
		-	_	d to participate	85	0	1	3	2	3	6		****/1182	****	4.29	4.35	4.42	****
		_		d open discussion	85	0	1	2	2	2	8		****/1170	****	4.34	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	esstul		85	9	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	***
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27						Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 7	3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	64
28-55							_			-						_		
56-83	3 4 2.00-2.99 5 C 9					Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 10	0	Non-	major	36
84-150	29	D 0																
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot	her					0						

Course-Section: BIOL 305 01 University of Mary Title Comp. Animal Physiolog Baltimore County Instructor: Lohr, Bernard (Instr. B) Spring 2010

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 100

261

University of Maryland Page 181
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

		Ouestionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Gener	 -1															
1 Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,sk		m this course	8	0	1	Λ	10	32	49	4.39	732/1447	4.49	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.39
		ctor make clea			8	0	1	2	17	36	36	4.13	965/1447		4.28	4.27	4.23	4.13
		uestions refle			8	0	1	4	17	34	36	4.09	887/1241	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.09
		uations reflec			8	51	2	1	5	14	19	4.15	873/1402	4.23	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.15
				what you learned	9	3	3	4	18	25	38	4.03	783/1358	4.04	4.09	4.11	4.10	4.03
	_	_		o what you learned	9	70	4	2	7	1	7	3.24	****/1316	4.04	4.13	4.14	4.13	***
		g system clear		-	9	0	1	1	10	22	57	4.46	513/1427	4.47	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.46
8. How ma	any times	was class can	celled		10	1	0	0	2	4	83	4.91	436/1447	4.93	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How wo	ould you	grade the over	all teac	hing effectiveness	21	1	0	1	4	41	32	4.33	540/1434	3.86	4.03	4.10	4.09	3.65
_		Lectu		_			_											
		uctor's lectur			16	0	Τ	Ţ	1	15	66	4.71	490/1387		4.48	4.46	4.44	
		ctor seem inte			16	0	0	0	3 5	10	71 58	4.81	784/1387		4.70	4.73	4.71	4.66
		terial presento es contribute		explained clearly	16 17	0	1	1 2	5 7	19 20	58 53	4.57	539/1386 699/1380	4.13 4.23	4.28 4.38	4.32	4.30	3.89 4.02
				you learned our understanding	19	12	1	1	12	20 15	40	4.47	420/1193			4.32	4.32	4.02
5. Did at	uuiovisua.	i tecimiiques e	illialice y	our understanding	19	12			12	13	40	4.33	420/1193	4.31	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.10
		Discu	ssion															
1. Did cl	lass disc			what you learned	85	0	1	2	3	3	6	3.73	****/1172	****	4.14	4.15	4.24	***
				ed to participate	85	0	1	3	2	3	6	3.67	****/1182	****	4.29	4.35	4.42	***
				d open discussion	85	0	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	****/1170	****	4.34	4.38	4.49	***
4. Were s	special te	echniques succ	essful	_	85	9	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utic	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 26			 quir						Graduat		0	Majo		64
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 31		Ke	durr.	eu I	OI I	ia jui	5 /	3	Graduati	=	U	мајс	'I	04
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C 9		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad 10	0	Non-	major	36
84-150	29	3.00-3.49	12	D 0			a.	_				-	011001 9		-	2.021		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	_f h
	-		-	P 0									respons				_	•
				I 0		Otl	her					0	_		5			
				? 9														

Course-Section: BIOL 305 01

Title Comp Animal Physio. La

Instructor: Lake, Reagan A

Enrollment: 119
Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 182 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions				Fre	eane	ncie	S		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, akilla from this course 0	Questions	NR	NA		_			5							
1. Did you gain new insights, akilla from this course 0															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. New many times was class cancelled 8. New the many times was class cancelled 8. New the instructor's lectures well prepared 8. New the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. To 0 0 0 0 0 7 46 4.87 261/1387 4.65 4.48 4.46 4.44 4.87 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor's cemminate to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase contribute to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Were equal students actively encouraged to participate 9. Did the lab instructor encourage file and open discussion 9. To 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	General														
3. Did the exem questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did yet revaluations reflect the expected goals 6. Did written easignments contribute to what you learned 7. What the grading system clearly explained 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. How would you grade the ov	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	15	43	4.68	386/1447	4.49	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Bow would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. The contribute to what you learned 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0 2 0 1 10 37 4.66 024/1193 4.31 4.14 4.02 4.05 4.60 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to a participate 9. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9. Were all students actively encourage that and open discussion 54 0 1 0 0 0 3 2 3 4.00 ***/1172 **** 4.14 4.15 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 1 0 1 0 2 2 3 4.00 ***/1170 ****/1182 **** 4.14 4.15 4.24 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 28 1 0 0 1 0 2 3 4.65 78/187 4.65 4.68 4.34 4.00 4.66 4.81 *** Seminar 1. Were enabled topics relevant to the amnounced theme 59 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 66 **** 4.00 4.58 4.17 **** Per analysis of 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		0	0	0	0	3	14	43	4.67	352/1447	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was calsas cancelled 9. 2 1 0 0 7 11 39 4.50 459/1427 4.47 4.22 4.19 4.15 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. 2 1 0 0 0 1 5 6.49 89 97/1447 4.93 4.75 4.69 4.65 4.98 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Were the instructor's lecture 1. Were the instructor's lecture well prepared 7. 0 0 0 0 0 7 46 4.87 261/1387 4.65 4.68 4.64 4.44 4.87 2. Did the instructor assistance on the subject 7 0 0 0 0 0 7 46 4.87 261/1387 4.65 4.68 4.64 4.44 4.87 2. Did the instructor assistance on the subject 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 46 4.87 261/1387 4.65 4.68 4.64 4.44 4.87 2. Did the instructor assistance on the subject 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	5	10	42	4.56	496/1241	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 1 0 0 1 1 56 4.98 87/1447 4.97 4.2 4.19 4.15 4.50 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. 2 1 0 0 0 1 5 6 4.98 87/1447 4.93 4.75 4.69 4.65 4.94 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 6 4.98 87/1447 4.93 4.75 4.69 4.65 4.98 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 7. 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 7 46 4.87 261/1387 4.65 4.48 4.46 4.44 4.87 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 7. 0 1 0 1 6 4.77 829/1387 4.70 4.70 4.73 4.71 4.77 1. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7. 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 37 4.62 481/1386 4.13 4.28 4.32 4.30 4.62 1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 54 0 1 0 0 2 3 3 4.50 ***/1122 **** 4.14 4.15 4.24 **** 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 54 0 1 0 0 2 3 3 4.50 ***/1122 **** 4.14 4.15 4.24 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 2 0 0 0 3 10 18 4.48 50/168 4.84 4.70 4.48 4.36 4.81 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 5 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ***/ 60 *** 4.00 4.56 4.12 **** 2. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ***/ 66 *** 4.00 4.56 4.12 **** 2. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ***/ 66 *** 4.00 4.56 4.13 **** 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ***/ 66 *** 4.00 4.56 4.11 **** 3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						6				616/1402			4.24	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 1 0 7 11 39 4.50 459/427 4.74 4.22 4.75 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 0 0 1 6 6 4.98 97/1447 4.93 4.75 4.69 4.65 4.99 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 2 1 0 0 2 28 18 4.27 623/1434 3.86 4.03 4.10 4.09 4.27 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 7 0 0 0 0 7 46 4.87 261/1387 4.65 4.48 4.46 4.44 4.87 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 1 0 1 6 45 4.77 829/1387 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.73 4.71 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 0 1 1 6 45 4.77 829/1387 4.05 4.28 4.32 4.30 4.62 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 1 1 0 0 1 4 38 4.66 463/1380 4.13 4.12 4.02 4.05 4.66 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0 2 0 1 10 37 4.60 224/110 3.14 4.02 4.05 4.66 2. Were all students actively encourage to participate 5 4 0 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 ***/1102 *** 4.29 4.35 4.42 **** 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 54 0 1 0 0 0 2 3 4.00 ***/1102 *** 4.29 4.35 4.42 **** 2. Were special techniques understanding of the material 2.8 1 0 1 0 0 2 3 4.00 ***/1102 *** 4.29 4.35 4.42 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2.8 0 1 0 0 2 3 4.00 ***/1102 *** 4.20 4.05 4.61 2.12 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2.8 0 1 0 0 1 3 27 4.81 36/189 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.81 4.10 the lab increase understanding of the material 2.8 1 0 0 1 1 3 27 4.84 36/186 4.84 4.70 4.84 4.36 4.84 4.10 the lab increase understanding of the material 2.8 1 0 0 1 1 0 3 27 4.81 36/189 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.81 4.10 the lab increase understanding of the material 2.8 1 0 0 1 1 0 3 20 4.00 ***/160 4.84 4.70 4.84 4.26 4.81 4.84 4.84 4.84 4.84 4.84 4.84 4.84	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	9		2	11	13	21	4.06	767/1358	4.04	4.09	4.11	4.10	4.06
8. Now many times was class cancelled 2 1 0 0 0 0 1 5 6 4.98 97/1447 4.93 4.75 4.69 4.65 4.98 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 2 1 0 0 2 28 18 4.27 623/143 4.86 4.03 4.00 4.09 4.27 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 7 0 0 0 0 7 46 4.87 261/1387 4.65 4.48 4.46 4.44 4.87 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 1 0 1 6 4.5 4.77 829/1387 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.73 4.71 4.77 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 0 4 12 37 4.62 483/1386 4.13 4.28 4.32 4.30 4.62 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 1 1 0 0 14 8 4.66 463/1386 4.23 4.38 4.32 4.32 4.65 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0 2 0 1 10 37 4.60 224/1193 4.31 4.14 4.02 4.05 4.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0 2 0 1 10 37 4.60 224/1193 4.31 4.14 4.02 4.05 4.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0 2 0 1 10 37 4.60 224/1193 4.31 4.14 4.15 4.24 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 54 0 1 0 0 1 1 4 4.17 ****/1172 **** 4.14 4.15 4.24 **** 2. Were special techniques woccessful 54 0 1 0 0 1 3 7 4.81 36/180 *** 4.34 4.38 4.49 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 28 1 0 0 1 0 3 27 4.81 36/180 *** 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.69 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 1 0 0 1 0 3 27 4.81 36/180 4.84 4.70 4.78 4.84 4.20 4.03 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 1 0 0 1 0 1 3 27 4.81 36/180 4.84 4.70 4.78 4.84 4.20 4.03 3. Were necessary materials available for individual attention 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.00 4.58 4.21 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.00 4.58 4.21 **** 3. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.00 4.58 4.21 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.00 4.58 4.21 **** 2. Were your conded with adequate to what you learned 59 0 0 0	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		_	2			12	26	4.04	795/1316	4.04	4.13	4.14	4.13	
2. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9 2 1 0 2 28 18 4.27 623/1434 3.86 4.03 4.10 4.09 4.27	 Was the grading system clearly explained 		0	1	0	7	11	39	4.50	459/1427	4.47	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.50
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7	8. How many times was class cancelled	2		0	0	0	1	56	4.98	97/1447	4.93	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.98
1. Mere the instructor's lectures well prepared 7 0 0 0 0 7 46 4.87 261/1387 4.65 4.48 4.46 4.48 4.87 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 1 0 1 0 1 4 45 4.77 829/1387 4.70 4.70 4.73 4.71 4.77 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 0 4 12 37 4.62 483/1386 4.13 4.28 4.32 4.32 4.66 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0 2 0 1 10 37 4.60 224/1193 4.31 4.14 4.02 4.05 4.60 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0 2 0 1 10 37 4.60 224/1193 4.31 4.14 4.02 4.05 4.60 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0 2 0 1 10 37 4.60 224/1193 4.31 4.14 4.02 4.05 4.60 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0 0 0 1 4 4.17 ****/1172 **** 4.14 4.15 4.24 ***** 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	0	2	28	18	4.27	623/1434	3.86	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 1 0 1 6 45 4.77 829/1887 4.70 4.70 4.73 4.71 4.77 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 0 1 2 37 4.62 483/1386 4.13 4.28 4.32 4.30 4.62 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 1 1 0 0 0 14 38 4.66 463/1380 4.23 4.38 4.32 4.30 4.65 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0 2 0 1 10 37 4.60 224/1193 4.31 4.14 4.02 4.05 4.60 Discussion Discussion	Lecture														
2. pid the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 1 0 1 6 45 4.77 829/1387 4.70 4.70 4.73 4.71 4.77 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 0 1 2 37 4.62 483/1386 4.13 4.28 4.32 4.30 4.62 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 1 1 0 0 0 14 38 4.66 463/1380 4.23 4.38 4.32 4.30 4.62 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0 2 0 1 10 37 4.60 224/1193 4.31 4.14 4.02 4.05 4.60 Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 54 0 1 0 0 0 1 4 4.17 ****/1172 **** 4.14 4.15 4.24 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 54 0 1 0 0 0 2 3 4.00 ***/1182 **** 4.29 4.35 4.42 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 54 0 1 0 0 2 3 4.00 ***/1170 **** 4.34 4.38 4.49 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 28 1 0 1 0 3 27 4.81 36/189 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.81 3.80 *** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 **** 4.80 *** 4.80 ***		7	0	0	0	0	7	46	4.87	261/1387	4.65	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. O 0 0 4 12 37 4.62 483/1386 4.13 4.28 4.32 4.26 4.65 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. O 0 0 1 4 38 4.66 463/1380 4.22 4.38 4.32 4.26 4.60 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 54 0 1 0 0 1 4 4.17 ****/1172 **** 4.14 4.15 4.24 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 54 0 1 0 0 2 3 3 4.50 ****/1170 **** 4.29 4.35 4.42 **** 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 54 0 1 0 0 2 3 4.00 ****/1170 **** 4.24 4.34 4.25 4.25 **** 2. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were your provided with adequate background information 2. Were your provided with adequate background information 2. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2. Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Were criteria for grading made clear 4. Did the desperience contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 5. Did gou clearly understand your evaluation criteria 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did study questions make clear		7	0	1	0	1	6	45							4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0 2 0 1 10 37 4.66 224/1193 4.31 4.14 4.02 4.05 4.66 Discussion	·	7	0	0	0	4	12	37	4.62						4.62
Discussion Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 54 0 1 0 0 0 1 4 4.17 ****/1172 **** 4.14 4.15 4.24 **** Discussion Discussions contribute to what you learned 54 0 1 0 0 0 1 4 4.17 ****/1172 **** 4.14 4.15 4.24 **** Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 54 0 1 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 ****/1182 **** 4.29 4.35 4.42 **** Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 54 0 1 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 ****/1182 **** 4.29 4.35 4.42 **** Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material 28 1 0 1 0 3 27 4.81 36/189 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.81 4.10 **** Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 1 0 1 4 2.6 4.69 56/192 4.69 4.68 4.34 4.20 4.69 4.12 **** Did the lab increase understanding of the material 28 1 0 0 1 3 27 4.81 36/189 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.81 4.10 the lab instructor provide assistance 28 1 0 1 1 6 23 4.65 78/189 4.84 4.70 4.48 4.36 4.84 4.10 the lab instructor provide assistance 28 1 0 1 1 6 23 4.65 78/189 4.65 4.67 4.33 4.11 4.65 4.69 56/192 4.69 4.68 4.34 4.20 4.09 4.65 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28 1 0 0 1 3 10 18 4.48 50/168 4.48 4.70 4.48 4.36 4.84 4.70 4.73 *** Newre assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 28 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 66 *** 4.00 4.58 4.17 **** Was the instructor available for individual attention 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 66 *** 4.00 4.56 4.21 **** Did presentations contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 66 *** 4.00 4.58 4.17 **** Did field experience contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 65 *** 4.50 4.41 2.87 **** Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 64 *** 3.50 4.09 3.38 **** Field Work Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 27 **** 4.30 4.42 **** Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ***/ 28 **** 4.00 4.57 5.00 **** Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.0					0										
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 54 0 1 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 ****/1172 **** 4.14 4.15 4.24 **** 2.00 1.00 0 3 3 4.50 ****/1170 **** 4.34 4.38 4.49 **** 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00					0	1									4.60
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 54 0 1 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 ****/1172 **** 4.14 4.15 4.24 **** 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 54 0 1 0 0 2 3 4.00 ****/1170 **** 4.34 4.38 4.49 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 54 0 1 0 0 2 3 4.00 ****/1170 **** 4.34 4.38 4.49 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 54 0 1 0 0 2 3 4.00 ****/1170 **** 4.20 4.06 4.12 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 28 1 0 1 0 3 27 4.81 36/189 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.81 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 1 0 1 4 26 4.69 56/192 4.69 4.68 4.34 4.20 4.69 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 1 0 0 1 3 27 4.81 36/189 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.20 4.69 3. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28 1 0 0 1 3 27 4.81 36/189 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.20 4.05 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28 1 0 0 3 10 18 4.48 50/168 4.48 4.48 4.20 4.02 4.48 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 59 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 66 **** 4.00 4.58 4.17 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 62 **** 4.00 4.58 4.17 **** 2. Were criteria for grading made clear 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 64 **** 4.50 4.42 4.01 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.50 4.09 3.38 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 4.50 4.40 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.7	Diamondan														
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 54 0 0 0 0 0 3 3 4.50 ****/182 **** 4.29 4.35 4.42 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 54 0 1 0 0 2 3 4.00 ****/187 **** 4.29 4.35 4.42 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 54 0 1 0 0 2 3 4.00 ****/187 **** 4.20 4.06 4.12 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 28 1 0 1 0 1 4.25 ****/ 800 **** 4.20 4.06 4.12 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 28 0 1 0 1 4 26 4.69 56/192 4.69 4.68 4.34 4.20 4.69 3.00 **** 4. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 1 0 1 4 26 4.69 56/192 4.69 4.68 4.34 4.20 4.69 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.26 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.26 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.26 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.26 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.26 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.26 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.26 4.81 4.74 4.34		EΛ	0	1	0	0	1	1	1 17	**** /1170	****	1 11	A 1E	1 21	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 54 0 1 0 0 2 3 4 .00 ****/1170 **** 4.34 4.38 4.49 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 54 2 0 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 ****/800 **** 4.20 4.06 4.12 **** Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 28 1 0 1 0 3 27 4.81 36/189 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.81 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 1 0 1 4 26 4.69 56/192 4.69 4.68 4.34 4.20 4.69 4.81 4.70 4.48 4.36 4.84 4.10 d. 4.81 4.70 4.88 4.84 4.10 d. 4.81 4.70 d. 4.										,					
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2. Were quirements for lab reports clearly specified 2. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3. Did fresearch projects contribute to what you learned 3. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 6. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 7. Were the field by the field study of the field study o						-				, -					
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 28 1 0 1 0 1 4 26 4.69 56/192 4.69 4.68 4.34 4.20 4.69 3. Were pou provided with adequate background information 28 0 1 0 1 4 26 4.69 56/192 4.69 4.68 4.34 4.20 4.69 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 1 0 0 1 3 27 4.81 36/189 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.20 4.69 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 28 1 0 0 1 1 6 23 4.65 78/187 4.65 4.67 4.33 4.11 4.65 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28 1 0 0 3 10 18 4.48 50/168 4.48 4.48 4.20 4.02 4.48 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 66 **** 4.00 4.58 4.17 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 62 **** 4.00 4.56 4.21 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.50 4.42 4.01 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 64 **** 4.50 4.42 4.01 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.00 4.58 3.81 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluations 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 2. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.42 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 28 ***** 4.50 4.42 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0					-	-	_	-		,					
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 28 1 0 1 0 3 27 4.81 36/189 4.81 4.74 4.34 4.26 4.81 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 1 0 1 4 26 4.69 56/192 4.69 4.68 4.34 4.20 4.69 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 1 0 0 1 3 27 4.84 36/186 4.84 4.70 4.48 4.36 4.84 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 28 1 0 1 1 6 23 4.65 78/187 4.65 4.67 4.33 4.11 4.65 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28 1 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 66 4.48 4.48 4.20 4.02 4.48	4. Were special techniques successiul	54	۷	U	U	U	3	1	4.25	***/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 28 0 1 0 1 4 26 4.69 56/192 4.69 4.68 4.34 4.20 4.69 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 1 0 0 1 3 27 4.84 36/186 4.84 4.70 4.48 4.36 4.84 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 28 1 0 1 1 6 23 4.65 78/187 4.65 4.67 4.33 4.11 4.65 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28 1 0 0 0 3 10 18 4.48 50/168 4.48 4.40 4.20 4.02 4.48 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 66 **** 4.00 4.58 4.17 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 62 **** 4.00 4.56 4.21 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.50 4.41 2.87 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.50 4.42 4.01 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.50 4.09 3.38 **** 5. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.00 4.25 3.81 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 4.50 4.42 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.42 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.43 4.50 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.72 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.66 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.66 5.00 **** 2.	Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 1 0 0 1 1 3 27 4.84 36/186 4.84 4.70 4.48 4.36 4.84 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 28 1 0 1 1 6 23 4.65 78/187 4.65 4.67 4.33 4.11 4.65 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28 1 0 0 0 3 10 18 4.48 50/168 4.48 4.48 4.20 4.02 4.48 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 29 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 66 **** 4.00 4.58 4.17 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 62 **** 4.00 4.56 4.21 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.50 4.41 2.87 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.50 4.09 3.38 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.42 4.01 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.42 4.40 **** 4.70	1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	1	0	3	27	4.81	36/ 189	4.81	4.74	4.34	4.26	4.81
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 28 1 0 0 1 1 3 27 4.84 36/186 4.84 4.70 4.48 4.36 4.84 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 28 1 0 1 1 6 23 4.65 78/187 4.65 4.67 4.33 4.11 4.65 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 28 1 0 0 0 3 10 18 4.48 50/168 4.48 4.48 4.20 4.02 4.48 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 29 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 66 **** 4.00 4.58 4.17 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 62 **** 4.00 4.56 4.21 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.50 4.41 2.87 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.50 4.09 3.38 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.42 4.01 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.42 4.40 **** 4.70	2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	1	4	26	4.69	56/ 192	4.69	4.68	4.34	4.20	4.69
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme		28	1	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	36/ 186	4.84	4.70	4.48	4.36	4.84
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	1	1	6	23	4.65	78/ 187	4.65	4.67	4.33	4.11	4.65
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme		28	1	0	0	3	10	18	4.48	50/ 168	4.48	4.48	4.20	4.02	4.48
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 62 **** 4.00 4.56 4.21 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.50 4.41 2.87 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.50 4.41 2.87 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.50 4.09 3.38 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 28 **** 4.50 4.42 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.30 4.42 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.30 4.42 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 27 **** **** 4.43 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.72 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 ****		59	0	0	Ο	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 66	****	4 00	4 58	4 17	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 58 **** 4.50 4.41 2.87 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.50 4.42 4.01 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.50 4.09 3.38 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 1 0 0.00 1 0 0.00 0	-									,					****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 65 **** 4.50 4.42 4.01 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.50 4.09 3.38 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.52 4.46 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** 4.30 4.42 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 27 **** 4.43 4.50 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 27 **** **** 4.43 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.72 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 59 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 ****							-	-		, 02					****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 64 **** 3.50 4.09 3.38 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.00 4.25 3.81 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.52 4.46 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 27 **** **** 4.30 4.42 **** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 27 **** **** 4.43 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 59 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 ****								-		,	****				****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.52 4.46 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.30 4.42 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 27 **** **** 4.43 4.50 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 ****	-							-		,					****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 38 **** 5.00 4.49 4.73 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 28 **** **** 4.52 4.46 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.30 4.42 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 27 **** **** 4.43 4.50 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 ****	7, 11														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.00 4.25 3.81 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 28 *** **** 4.52 4.46 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 59 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.30 4.42 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 27 **** **** 4.43 4.50 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 27 **** **** 4.43 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.72 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 ****		- 0	0	•	_	0	-	0	4 00	***** / 20	ale ale ale ale	F 00	4 40	4 50	ate ate ate ate
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 4.52 4.46 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 30 *** *** 4.52 4.46 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 27 *** *** 4.43 4.50 *** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 31 *** 5.00 4.72 5.00 *** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 21 *** 5.00 4.57 5.00 *** 3. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 20 *** 5.00 4.64 5.00 ****	-							-							
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 30 **** **** 4.30 4.42 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 27 **** **** 4.43 4.50 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 ****								-		, 50					
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 27 **** **** 4.43 4.50 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.72 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 ****									0.00	, 20					
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 ****								-		,					
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 5.00 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 ****	5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	Τ	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 21 **** 5.00 4.57 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 31 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 20 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 ****	Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 59 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.64 5.00 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 20 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 ****		59	0		0		0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 59 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 20 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 ****							0	1		,			4.57	5.00	
		59					-	0	3.00	,	****		4.64	5.00	
	7 7 7	59					0	1		,			4.60	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 59 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 15 **** 5.00 4.61 5.00 ****	5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	***	5.00	4.61	5.00	***

Course-Section: BIOL 305 01

Title Comp Animal Physio. La

Instructor: Lake, Reagan A

Enrollment: 119
Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 182 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	36	Required for Majors	49	Graduate	0	Major	53
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	7
84-150	24	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 395 1 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 183

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title MARC U*STAR Writ in Sc Farabaugh, Robin Instructor:

Enroll Questi

Enrollment: Questionnaires:	2 Student C	Course	Eval	uati	on Qı	uesti	ionn	aire	e						
				Fr	eque	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 n	ew insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instru	ctor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.23	5.00
4. Did other eval	uations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	494/1402	4.75	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned r	eadings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	799/1358	2.50	4.09	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written as	signments contribute to what you learned	ed 0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.13	4.14	4.13	5.00
7. Was the gradin	g system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.25	4.22	4.19	4.15	5.00

8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1447 4.75 4.75 4.69 4.65 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 341/1434 4.50 4.03 4.10 4.09 4.50

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.75	4.48	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.75	4.28	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.32	5.00

5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 1087/1193 3.00 4.14 4.02 4.05 3.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.14	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.29	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.20	4.06	4.12	5.00

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

Course-Section: BIOL 395 2 University of Maryland Page 184
Title MARC U*STAR Writ in Sc Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Farabaugh, Robin

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 2

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	532/1447	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.75	4.27	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1358/1358	2.50	4.09	4.11	4.10	1.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.13	4.14	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1259/1427	4.25	4.22	4.19	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	798/1387	4.75	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	607/1386	4.75	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.32	5.00

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

Course-Section: BIOL 414 01 University of Maryland Title Eukaryotics Gen/Mol Bi Baltimore County Instructor: Lindahl, Lasse A (Instr. A) Spring 2010

iversity of Maryland Page 185
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	35				
Questionnaires:	25	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

I

0

0

							LTC	=quei	TCTE	5		TIID	LIUCCOI	COULSE	Debr	UMDC	пелет	Secr
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	1	0	0	2	2	12	8	4.08	1017/1447	4.08	4.48	4.31	4.43	4.08
		tor make clear			1	0	0	1	6	13			1189/1447		4.28	4.27	4.31	3.83
		estions reflect			1	0	0	1	8	9	6	3.83	1034/1241	3.83	4.26	4.33	4.41	3.83
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	1	0	4	12	7	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	12	7	4.00	799/1358	4.00	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	10	8	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	1	1	1	0	4	10	8	4.04	948/1427	4.04	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.04
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	243/1447	4.96	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.96
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	1	0	6	9	5	3.81	1052/1434	3.93	4.03	4.10	4.17	3.93
		Lecture																
		ctor's lecture			1	0	0	3		11			1282/1387			4.46		3.83
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	1					1107/1387			4.73		
				explained clearly	1		1	1					1220/1386			4.32	4.34	
		s contribute to		-	1	0	1	3			7		1138/1380			4.32	4.34	
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	0	1	3	9	10	4.22	509/1193	4.30	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.30
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al-	aga digan			what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.91	801/1172	2 01	4.14	4.15	4.25	3.91
				ed to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2			292/1182			4.35	4.49	4.82
				d open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	4		4.27	. ,			4.38	4.51	
		chniques succe		a open arbeabaton	14	4	1	0	2	0	-	3.86						3.86
1	poorar oc	oming account	00141			-	_	Ü	_	Ü	-	3.00	337, 333	3.00	1120	2.00	1.17	3.00
				Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	.5	Graduat	e 1	0	Majo	r	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		_	_						1	, .	_			4.5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	5	Non-	major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0								4			1			1-
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		E⊥€	ectiv	ves				4	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0		1						_	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcan	ı٦	

Other

1

Frequencies

Course-Section: BIOL 414 01 University of Maryland Title Eukaryotics Gen/Mol Bi Baltimore County Instructor: Zengel, Janice M (Instr. B) Spring 2010

Instructor: Zengel, Janice M (Instr. B)
Enrollment: 35

4. Were special techniques successful

Enrollment: 35
Ouestionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 186

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	12	8	4.08	1017/1447	4.08	4.48	4.31	4.43	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	13	4	3.83	1189/1447	3.83	4.28	4.27	4.31	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	8	9	6	3.83	1034/1241	3.83	4.26	4.33	4.41	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	12	7	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	12	7	4.00	799/1358	4.00	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	10	8	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	4	10	8	4.04	948/1427	4.04	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	243/1447	4.96	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	8	7	4.05	828/1434	3.93	4.03	4.10	4.17	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	8	8	8	4.00	1176/1387	3.83	4.48	4.46	4.48	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	1107/1387	4.54	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	10	7	3.92	1119/1386	3.79	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	9	11	4.21	934/1380	4.02	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.02
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	382/1193	4.30	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	801/1172	3.91	4.14	4.15	4.25	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	292/1182		4.29	4.35	4.49	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	751/1170		4.34	4.38	4.51	4.27

Frequency Distribution

14 4 1 0 2 0 4 3.86 537/800 3.86 4.20 4.06 4.19 3.86

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	10	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 420 1 University of Maryland Title Adv Topics:Cell Biolog

Baltimore County Spring 2010

McGraw,Patricia Instructor:

4. Were special techniques successful

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 20

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 187

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	5	4	4	3	2.85	1429/1447	2.85	4.48	4.31	4.43	2.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	5	7	2	3	2.85	1414/1447	2.85	4.28	4.27	4.31	2.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	8	5	3.80	1054/1241	3.80	4.26	4.33	4.41	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	7	3	3.42	1281/1402	3.42	4.27	4.24	4.34	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	2	3	3	5	3.18	1268/1358	3.18	4.09	4.11	4.15	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1230/1316	3.22	4.13	4.14	4.27	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	8	2	2	3	4	2.63	1392/1427	2.63	4.22	4.19	4.20	2.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	11	8	0	1	0	1.55	1447/1447	1.55	4.75	4.69	4.72	1.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	9	1	4	0	2	2.06	1424/1434	2.06	4.03	4.10	4.17	2.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	6	2	4	1	4	2.71	1367/1387	2.71	4.48	4.46	4.48	2.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	6	3	8	3.94	1332/1387	3.94	4.70	4.73	4.76	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	6	1	5	3.11	1321/1386	3.11	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	3	6	1	4	2.89	1329/1380	2.89	4.38	4.32	4.34	2.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	3	2	3	3	4	3.20	1050/1193	3.20	4.14	4.02	4.00	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	1	Ο	2	2 83	1127/1172	2.83	4.14	4.15	4.25	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	3	0	1	0	2		1166/1182	2.67	4.29	4.35	4.49	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	0	0	1	2		1148/1170		4.34		4.51	2.83

Frequency Distribution

14 2 1 1 1 0 1 2.75 ****/ 800 **** 4.20 4.06 4.19 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	13
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	4						

Course-Section: BIOL 428 1

Title Computer Appl Molec Bi

Instructor: Oneill,Michael

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 5 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 188 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1238/1447	3.80	4.48	4.31	4.43	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1350/1447	3.40	4.28	4.27	4.31	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1215/1241	3.00	4.26	4.33	4.41	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1384/1402	2.75	4.27	4.24	4.34	2.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1344/1358	2.33	4.09	4.11	4.15	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1299/1316	2.50	4.13	4.14	4.27	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	154/1427	4.80	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1150/1434	3.67	4.03	4.10	4.17	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	2 9 0	1362/1387	2.80	4.48	4.46	4.48	2.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	1	3		1320/1387	4.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	0	1			1345/1386	2.80	4.70	4.73		2.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	0	2		1297/1380		4.38	4.32	4.34	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	U		_		U	U	4	3.23	1297/1300	3.23	4.30	4.32	4.34	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	4.14	4.15	4.25	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1037/1182	3.67	4.29	4.35	4.49	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	480/1170	4.67	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	****/ 189	****	4.74	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 192	****	4.74	4.34		****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 186	****	4.70	4.48	4.61 4.72	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 187	****	4.70	4.40	4.72	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 168		4.48	4.33	4.53	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	4	U	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	100		4.40	4.20	4.55	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.87	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.55	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****		4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 27		****	4.43	4.62	****
5. 214 conferences help jou carry out rich detivities	-	J	J	_	J	J	J	2.00	, 21			1.15	1.02	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.80	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 428 1

Title Computer Appl Molec Bi

Instructor: Oneill, Michael

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 188 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Baltimore County McGraw, Patricia Gluick, Tom Spring 2010

Enrollment: 111

Instructor:

Ouestionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 189 JUN 28, 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 0 0 0 1 2 2 1 3.50 1339/1447 3.50 4.48 4.31 4.43 3.50 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 2 1 2 1 3.33 1361/1447 3.33 4.28 4.27 4.31 3.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 2 1 2 3.50 1143/1241 3.50 4.26 4.33 4.41 3.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 1 1 1 2 3.33 1231/1358 3.33 4.09 4.11 4.15 3.33 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 5 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1316 **** 4.13 4.14 4.27 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 2 0 1 2 3.17 1347/1427 3.17 4.22 4.19 4.20 3.17 0 0 0 2 1 0 3 3.67 1426/1447 3.67 4.75 4.69 4.72 3.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 1 2 0 2 0 2.60 1399/1434 2.60 4.03 4.10 4.17 2.60 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 3 0 2 1 $3.17 \ 1340/1387 \ 3.17 \ 4.48 \ 4.46 \ 4.48 \ 3.17$ 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 1 0 1 2 2 $3.67 \ 1353/1387 \ 3.67 \ 4.70 \ 4.73 \ 4.76 \ 3.67$ 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 2 1 3.67 1220/1386 3.67 4.28 4.32 4.34 3.67 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 0 1 2 2 3.67 1198/1380 3.67 4.38 4.32 4.34 3.67 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1 0 1 2 1 1 3.40 999/1193 3.40 4.14 4.02 4.00 3.40 Discussion

 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	999/1172	3.50	4.14	4.15	4.25	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.29	4.35	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.00

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

Course-Section: BIOL 434 1

Microbial Molec Geneti

Title Instructor: Wolf JR, Richard

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 21

23

Baltimore County Spring 2010

University of Maryland

Page 190 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	q		Tnst	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	1	2	7	10	4.30	820/1447		4.48	4.31	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	479/1447		4.28	4.27	4.31	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.26	4.33	4.41	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	8	9	4.20	827/1402		4.27	4.24	4.34	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	312/1358	4.55	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	3	4	3		1097/1316		4.13	4.14	4.27	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4		4.60	337/1427	4.60	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	14	5		1286/1447	4.20	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.03	4.10	4.17	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	276/1387	4.85	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	793/1386		4.28	4.32	4.34	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	-	15	4.65	477/1380		4.38	4.32	4.34	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	7	5	7	4.00	652/1193		4.14	4.02	4.00	4.00
J. Did dddiovibdai econniques ciniance your anderstanding	_	_	O	O	,	3	,	1.00	032/1193	1.00	1.11	1.02	1.00	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	445/1172	4.43	4.14	4.15	4.25	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	158/1182	4.93	4.29	4.35	4.49	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	640/1170	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	655/ 800	3.50	4.20	4.06	4.19	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 189	****	4.74	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.68	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	4.70	4.48	4.72	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	4.67	4.33	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 168	****	4.48	4.20	4.53	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified	20	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/ 100		1.10	4.20	1.33	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 434 1

Title Microbial Molec Geneti

Instructor: Wolf Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 21

Wolf JR,Richard 23 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 190 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5 5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	9	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	_		
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 443 1 University of Maryland Title Adv Topics:Devel Biolo Instructor:

. .

0

1

Baltimore County Starz-Gaiano, Mi (Instr. A) Spring 2010

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 191

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 5 1		Genera	_		-	0	0	0	-		1.0	4 51	252/1445	4 51	4 40	4 21	4 42	4 51
_	_	ew insights,ski			1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	353/1447	4.71	4.48	4.31	4.43	4.71
		ctor make clear		_	Ι	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	413/1447	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.62
	_	estions reflec		_	2	14	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.26	4.33	4.41	5.00
		ations reflect		_	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	207/1402	4.76	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.76
	_	_		what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	201/1358	4.71	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.71
		_		o what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	292/1316	4.60	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.60
		g system clearl		ined	1	0	2	1	2	3	13	4.14	882/1427	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.14
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	836/1447		4.75	4.69	4.72	4.75
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	478/1434	4.44	4.03	4.10	4.17	4.44
		T																
11		Lectur			2	0	^	0	_	_	1.0	4 0 4	001/1005	4 00	4 40	1 16	4 40	4 00
		actor's lecture			3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	291/1387	4.82	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.82
	 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 							0	0	Τ	19	4.95	317/1387	4.98	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.97
					2	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	558/1386	4.63	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.63
		es contribute t			3	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	582/1380	4.61	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.61
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	2	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	174/1193	4.72	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.72
		- ·																
1 542		Discus		- dr t	1.0	0	0	0	0	1	_	4 02	162/1170	4 02	4 1 4	4 1 5	4 05	4 02
				what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	163/1172		4.14	4.15	4.25	4.83
		_	_	d to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.83	4.29	4.35	4.49	4.83
				d open discussion	15 16	0	0	1	0	1	5 6	4.43	640/1170	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.43
4. were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssiui		16	U	U	U	U	U	ь	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.20	4.06	4.19	5.00
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	ı									
Credits Ea	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	sons	3			Туј	pe 			Majors	:
00-27							quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	6	Graduat	e	3	Majo	r	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 4														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D 0														
Grad. $3 3.50-4.00 2 F 0$						Ele	ecti	ves				6			there are not enough		ŗh	
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
					2.1							•						

Other

0

Course-Section: BIOL 443 1 University of Maryland Title Adv Topics:Devel Biolo

Baltimore County

Instructor: Brewster, Rachel (Instr. B) Enrollment: 28

Questionnaires: 22

Page 192 JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Doddon	000100	_, ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	2 accountant

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	353/1447	4.71	4.48	4.31	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	413/1447	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.26	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	207/1402	4.76	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	201/1358	4.71	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	292/1316	4.60	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	3	13	4.14	882/1427	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	341/1434	4.44	4.03	4.10	4.17	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	353/1387	4.82	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1387	4.98	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	392/1386	4.63	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	477/1380	4.61	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	131/1193	4.72	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	163/1172	4.83	4.14	4.15	4.25	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.83	4.29	4.35	4.49	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	640/1170	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.20	4.06	4.19	5.00
•														

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

Course-Section: BIOL 456 1 University of Maryland Page 193
Title Plant Molecular Biolog Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Lu, Hua

Instructor: Lu, Hi Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 15 Spring 2010
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did you gain new	v insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	2	3	6	3.67	1290/1447	3.67	4.48	4.31	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instruct	or make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	1	6	3.60	1286/1447	3.60	4.28	4.27	4.31	3.60
3. Did the exam que	estions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	975/1241	3.93	4.26	4.33	4.41	3.93
4. Did other evalua	ations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	1101/1402	3.87	4.27	4.24	4.34	3.87
5. Did assigned rea	adings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	2	7	3.73	1036/1358	3.73	4.09	4.11	4.15	3.73
6. Did written ass:	ignments contribute to what you learned	l 0	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	933/1316	3.87	4.13	4.14	4.27	3.87
7. Was the grading	system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	3	4	3.53	1249/1427	3.53	4.22	4.19	4.20	3.53
8. How many times w	was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	339/1447	4.93	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.93
9. How would you gr	rade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1181/1434	3.62	4.03	4.10	4.17	3.62
1. Were the instruc	ctor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	1055/1387	4.23	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.23
	or seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1042/1387	4.62	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.62
3. Was lecture mate	erial presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	0	5	5	3.92	1111/1386	3.92	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.92
4. Did the lectures	s contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	2	1	6	3.69	1188/1380	3.69	4.38	4.32	4.34	3.69
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	564/1193	4.15	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.15
	Discussion														
1. Did class discus	ssions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	339/1172	4.57	4.14	4.15	4.25	4.57
	actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	621/1182	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.49	4.43
	or encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	440/1170	4.71	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.71
4. Were special ted		9	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	380/ 800	4.17	4.20	4.06	4.19	4.17
	[uenc]	/ Dis	trib	outio	n										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades	\$			Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0 A 6		Required for Majors 8						 8 Gradua		 e	0	Maio	 or	8

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	L	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	 6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there a	re not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 457 1 University of Maryland Page 194 Title JUN 28, 2010

Phys:Marine/Est Animal Baltimore County Spring 2010 Cronin, Thomas W

Ρ

. .

0

0

0

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 11

Instructor:

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

						Frequencies				Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	om this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	148/1447	4.90	4.48	4.31	4.43	4.90
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	315/1447	4.70	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.70
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect	t the e	expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	345/1241	4.70	4.26	4.33	4.41	4.70
4. Did ot	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.60
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ute to	what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	931/1358	3.89	4.09	4.11	4.15	3.89
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	671/1316	4.20	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.20
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1077/1427	3.90	4.22	4.19	4.20	3.90
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.90
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	578/1434	4.30	4.03	4.10	4.17	4.30
		Lecture	e															
1. Were t	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	253/1386	4.80	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.80
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	273/1380	4.80	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.80
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	168/1193	4.70	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.70
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribu	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	521/1172	4.33	4.14	4.15	4.25	4.33
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.29	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage i	fair ar	nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssful	-	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.19	****
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Туј	ре			Majors	5			
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 3 B 5		Red	quire	eu I	or Ma	Jor	S	6	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or.	8
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	В 5 С 1		Cor	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		Gei	icia.	L				U	onder -g.	Lau I	_	11011-	ilia JUL	3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives							3	3 #### - Means there are not enough			jh		

Other

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 195

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Student	Courge	Fvaluation	Ouestionnaire

						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	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	474/1447	4.60	4.48	4.31	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	911/1447	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	827/1241	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.41	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	616/1402	4.40	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1358	4.80	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1144/1427	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.20	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.03	4.10	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1176/1387	4.00	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject			0	0	0	1	4	4.80	784/1387	4.80	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly			0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	940/1380	4.20	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	843/1193	3.75	4.14	4.02	4.00	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 486 01

Title Genome Science Instructor: Bustos, Mauricio

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 9

Course-Section: BIOL 495 1 University of Maryland Title Seminar Bioinformatics Baltimore County Instructor: Kann, Maricel Ga (Instr. A) Spring 2010

Iniversity of Maryland Page 196
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

0

Enrollment:	4	
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I

0

0

						_	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.43	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.67
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.41	4.67
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	4.83	4.27	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	4.75	4.13	4.14	4.27	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.22	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.67
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overal	l teac	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.03	4.10	4.17	5.00
		Lecture		•			_	•		_			- 00	4 40		4 40		
		uctor's lectures		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387		4.48	4.46	4.48	5.00	
		n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00		
		xplained clearly	0	0 0	0	0	0	1	2		431/1386		4.28	4.32	4.34	4.58		
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding							0	0	0	3		1/1380		4.38	4.32	4.34	
5. Did aud	diovisua.	l techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.14	4.02	4.00	5.00
		Discuss	ion															
1 Did ala	ace dieci			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.14	4.15	4.25	5.00
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1182		4.29	4.35	4.49	5.00
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1170		4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
		echniques succes		a open arbeabaion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/800			4.06	4.19	5.00
		10000											_,					
				Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;			
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0						Rec	quire	ed f	or Ma	ijors	3	3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	3
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0						Gel	тста.	_				J	onder -g.	Luu	J	MOII-	101	J
						E14	ectiv	ves.				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
oraa.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0							v CD				0	respons				111	
													I CSPOIIS		c bigin	illican		

Other

Course-Section: BIOL 495 1 University of Maryland Title Seminar Bioinformatics Instructor:

Baltimore County Erill Sagales, I (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 197

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.41	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	4.83	4.27	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	4.75	4.13	4.14	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.22	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.03	4.10	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	607/1386	4.79	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.14	4.02	4.00	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.14	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.29	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.20	4.06	4.19	5.00

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

Course-Section: BIOL 495 2 University of Maryl Title Seminar Bioinformatics Baltimore County Instructor: Kann, Maricel Ga (Instr. A) Spring 2010

Grad.

3.50-4.00 0

F 0

0

P 0

I 0

University of Maryland Page 198
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	4			
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	you qain	new insights, ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.43	5.00
		ructor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.67
3. Did	the exam	questions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.41	4.67
4. Did	other ev	aluations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	314/1402	4.83	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.67
5. Did	assigned	readings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did	written	assignments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	392/1316	4.75	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.50
7. Was	the grad	ing system clearl	y expla	ained -	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.22	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How	many time	es was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.67
9. How	would yo	u grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.03	4.10	4.17	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Wer	e the ins	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.48	5.00		
	 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 							0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	0	2		1/1386	4.79	4.28	4.32	4.34	5.00
		ures contribute t			1 1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1380	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.34	5.00
				your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1193	5.00	4.14	4.02	4.00	5.00
		Discus	gion															
1 Did	class di	scussions contrib		what you learned	1	0	0	0	Ο	0	2	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.14	4.15	4.25	5.00
		dents actively en			1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1182	5.00	4.29	4.35	4.49	5.00
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1170	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
		techniques succe		id open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.20	4.06	4.19	5.00
				Frequ	onar	. Diat	- rib	ı+i or	2									
	lency	DIS	LIDI	ucioi	1													
Credit	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	3	Graduate	 e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			_			-								
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	3
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0													_				-	

Electives

0

Other

Course-Section: BIOL 495 2 University of Maryland Title Seminar Bioinformatics

I

0

0

Baltimore County Spring 2010

0

Page 199

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Erill Sagales, I (Instr. B) Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 3

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

Questions							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		 Genera																
1 Did 110	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this source	0	0	0	0	0	Λ	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.43	5.00
_	_	ew insignes,ski ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.67
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.41	4.67
	_	uations reflect		1 3	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	314/1402		4.27	4.24	4.34	4.67
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1		345/1358	4.50	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.50
	_	-		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1		392/1316	4.75	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.50
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.22	4.19	4.20	5.00
	_	was class canc		iiiied	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.67
				hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1434		4.03	4.10	4.17	
9. HOW WO	outa you	grade the overa	II teat	ming effectiveness	4	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	1/1434	3.00	4.03	4.10	4.1/	5.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did th	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was le	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.79	4.28	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.14	4.02	4.00	5.00
		Discus																
ו הגם ו					1	0	0	0	0	0	2	г оо	1/1170	5.00	1 11	4.15	4.25	5.00
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	-	2	5.00 5.00	1/1172		4.14	4.15	4.49	5.00
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182				4.49	
		ctor encourage echniques succe		d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170 1/ 800	5.00 5.00	4.34	4.38	4.19	5.00
4. Wele S	special c	eciniiques succe	SSLUI		Т	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.20	4.00	4.19	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	:			
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade										- 								
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	S	3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55																		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	3
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 2 D 0																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - Means there are not enough		jh			
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
		_ ^								•								

Other

Course-Section: BIOL 636 1

Title Adv Molec Biol Lab II

Instructor: Wolf,Julia B

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 5

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 200 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

General Ceneral Did you gain new insights, skills from this course O 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 254/1447 4.90 4.48 4.31 4.46 4.80 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals O 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 231/1241 4.40 4.26 4.33 4.36 4.80 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals O 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 231/1241 4.40 4.26 4.33 4.38 4.80 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals O 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 231/1241 4.40 4.26 4.33 4.38 4.80 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals O 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.60 801/402 4.80 4.27 4.24 4.29 4.60 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned Did written assignments contribute to what you learned D 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.75 173/1358 4.88 4.09 4.11 4.26 4.75 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned D 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 596/1427 4.70 4.22 4.19 4.25 4.40 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness Did up the instructor's lectures well prepared Discussion Discussion Lecture Discussion Discussion Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material D 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.80 231/1241 4.40 4.26 4.33 4.36 4.80 D 0 0 0 1 1 2 3.75 997/1316 4.38 4.09 4.11 4.26 4.75 Did the instructor 's lectures well prepared D 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 596/1427 4.70 4.22 4.19 4.25 Did the instructor 's lectures well prepared Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Laboratory Did the lab increase understanding of the material D 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.80 231/1241 4.40 4.90 4.11 4.94 D 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.50 659/1380 4.75 4.48 4.46 4.51 4.50 Did the lab increase understanding of the material D 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.80 254/1447 4.90 4.48 4.31 4.46 4.80 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 426/1447 4.80 4.28 4.27 4.30 4.60 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 231/1241 4.40 4.26 4.33 4.38 4.80 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 380/1402 4.80 4.27 4.24 4.29 4.60 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 173/1358 4.88 4.09 4.11 4.26 4.75 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 2 3.75 997/1316 4.38 4.13 4.14 4.34 3.75 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 596/1427 4.70 4.22 4.19 4.25 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 3 4.40 1556/1427 4.70 4.22 4.19 4.25 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 3 4.40 1556/1427 4.70 4.75 4.69 4.74 4.40 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 1 0 0 3 3.60 1888/1434 4.30 4.03 4.10 4.21 3.60 1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4 4.50 798/1387 4.75 4.48 4.46 4.51 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 1260/1387 4.63 4.70 4.73 4.81 4.25 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 3.75 843/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.02 3.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 843/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.02 3.75 4.04 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.0
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 426/1447 4.80 4.28 4.27 4.30 4.60 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 231/1241 4.40 4.26 4.33 4.38 4.80 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 380/1402 4.80 4.27 4.24 4.29 4.60 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.60 380/1402 4.80 4.27 4.24 4.29 4.60 5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 997/13158 4.88 4.09 4.11 4.26 4.75 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 997/1316 4.38 4.13 4.14 4.34 3.75 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 596/1427 4.70 4.22 4.19 4.25 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 596/1427 4.70 4.22 4.19 4.25 4.40 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 3 3.60 1188/1434 4.30 4.03 4.10 4.21 3.60 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 3 3.60 1188/1434 4.30 4.03 4.10 4.21 3.60 8. How would you grade the overall prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 798/1387 4.75 4.48 4.46 4.51 4.55 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 1260/1387 4.63 4.70 4.73 4.81 4.25 4.05 4.05 6. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 843/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.02 3.75 8. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.14 4.15 4.32 4.50 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 231/1241 4.40 4.26 4.33 4.38 4.80 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 380/1402 4.80 4.27 4.24 4.29 4.60 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 173/1358 4.88 4.09 4.11 4.26 4.75 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 997/1316 4.38 4.13 4.14 4.34 3.75 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 596/1427 4.70 4.22 4.19 4.25 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 155/1447 4.70 4.75 4.69 4.74 4.40 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 1 0 0 3 3.60 1188/1434 4.30 4.03 4.10 4.21 3.60 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 798/1387 4.75 4.48 4.46 4.51 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 1260/1387 4.63 4.70 4.73 4.81 4.25 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.25 1260/1387 4.63 4.70 4.73 4.81 4.25 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 3.75 843/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.02 3.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 377/1172 4.25 4.14 4.15 4.32 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 Laboratory
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. O 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 596/1427 4.70 4.22 4.19 4.25 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. O 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 1155/1447 4.70 4.75 4.69 4.74 4.40 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. O 1 1 0 0 0 3 3.60 1188/1434 4.30 4.03 4.10 4.21 3.60 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. O 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 1260/1387 4.63 4.70 4.73 4.81 4.25 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Discussion 1. Discussion 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Laboratory 4. C 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.50 377/1170 4.25 4.14 4.15 4.32 4.50 4. C 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 173/1358 4.88 4.09 4.11 4.26 4.75 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 2 3.75 997/1316 4.38 4.13 4.14 4.34 3.75 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 596/1427 4.70 4.22 4.19 4.25 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 1155/1447 4.70 4.75 4.69 4.74 4.40 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 3 3.60 1188/1434 4.30 4.03 4.10 4.21 3.60 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 798/1387 4.75 4.48 4.46 4.51 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 1260/1387 4.63 4.70 4.73 4.81 4.25 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 316/1386 4.88 4.28 4.32 4.43 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.50 659/1380 4.75 4.38 4.32 4.38 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 843/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.02 3.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 377/1172 4.25 4.14 4.15 4.32 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1078/1182 3.75 4.29 4.35 4.46 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 2 3.75 997/1316 4.38 4.13 4.14 4.34 3.75 7.5 Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 3 4.40 596/1427 4.70 4.22 4.19 4.25 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 3 4.40 1155/1447 4.70 4.75 4.69 4.74 4.40 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 3 3.60 1188/1434 4.30 4.03 4.10 4.21 3.60 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 798/1387 4.75 4.48 4.46 4.51 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 1260/1387 4.63 4.70 4.73 4.81 4.25 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 316/1386 4.88 4.28 4.32 4.43 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 3.75 843/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.02 3.75 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 843/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.02 3.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 3.50 1078/1182 3.75 4.29 4.35 4.46 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 Laboratory
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 596/1427 4.70 4.22 4.19 4.25 4.40 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 3 4.40 1155/1447 4.70 4.75 4.69 4.74 4.40 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 1 0 0 3 3.60 1188/1434 4.30 4.03 4.10 4.21 3.60 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 798/1387 4.75 4.48 4.46 4.51 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 1260/1387 4.63 4.70 4.73 4.81 4.25 4.01 dthe lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.75 316/1386 4.88 4.28 4.32 4.43 4.75 4.01 dthe lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 3.75 843/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.02 3.75 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 843/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.02 3.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 3.50 1078/1182 3.75 4.29 4.35 4.46 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 Laboratory
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 3 4.40 1155/1447 4.70 4.75 4.69 4.74 4.40 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 3 3.60 1188/1434 4.30 4.03 4.10 4.21 3.60 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 798/1387 4.75 4.48 4.46 4.51 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 1260/1387 4.63 4.70 4.73 4.81 4.25 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 316/1386 4.88 4.28 4.32 4.43 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 659/1380 4.75 4.38 4.32 4.38 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 843/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.02 3.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 377/1172 4.25 4.14 4.15 4.32 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1078/1182 3.75 4.29 4.35 4.46 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 Laboratory
Lecture Lect
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 1. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 798/1387 4.75 4.48 4.46 4.51 4.50 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 1260/1387 4.63 4.70 4.73 4.81 4.25 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1. 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 316/1386 4.88 4.28 4.32 4.43 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1. 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 659/1380 4.75 4.38 4.32 4.38 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1078/1182 3.75 4.29 4.35 4.46 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did dead for the factor of the
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 1260/1387 4.63 4.70 4.73 4.81 4.25 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 316/1386 4.88 4.28 4.32 4.43 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 659/1380 4.75 4.38 4.32 4.38 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 843/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.02 3.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 377/1172 4.25 4.14 4.15 4.32 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1078/1182 3.75 4.29 4.35 4.46 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 Laboratory
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 316/1386 4.88 4.28 4.32 4.43 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 659/1380 4.75 4.38 4.32 4.38 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 843/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.02 3.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 377/1172 4.25 4.14 4.15 4.32 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1078/1182 3.75 4.29 4.35 4.46 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 Laboratory
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 659/1380 4.75 4.38 4.32 4.38 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 843/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.02 3.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 377/1172 4.25 4.14 4.15 4.32 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1078/1182 3.75 4.29 4.35 4.46 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 Laboratory
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 1 0 0 1 2 3.75 843/1193 3.88 4.14 4.02 4.02 3.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 377/1172 4.25 4.14 4.15 4.32 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1078/1182 3.75 4.29 4.35 4.46 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 Laboratory
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 377/1172 4.25 4.14 4.15 4.32 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1078/1182 3.75 4.29 4.35 4.46 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 Laboratory
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 377/1172 4.25 4.14 4.15 4.32 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1078/1182 3.75 4.29 4.35 4.46 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 Laboratory
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 377/1172 4.25 4.14 4.15 4.32 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1078/1182 3.75 4.29 4.35 4.46 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 Laboratory
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1078/1182 3.75 4.29 4.35 4.46 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1070/1170 4.25 4.34 4.38 4.52 3.50 Laboratory
Laboratory
•
•
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 1 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/192 5.00 4.68 4.34 4.79 5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 1 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/186 5.00 4.70 4.48 4.73 5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 1 0 0 0 1 0 3 4.50 98/187 4.75 4.67 4.33 4.67 4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 1 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 17/ 168 4.88 4.48 4.20 4.55 4.75
Self Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/31 5.00 5.00 4.72 4.85 5.00 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.57 4.65 ****
2. Pla boad factoris mand bload one one confederation of the confederati
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 31 5.00 5.00 4.64 4.59 5.00
Frequency Distribution
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 5 Graduate 5 Major 1
28-55
56-83

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

Course-Section: BIOL 636 2 Title Adv Molec Biol Lab II

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Wolf,Julia B

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 201 JUN 28, 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.90	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.28	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	923/1241	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.80	4.27	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.09	4.11	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	4.38	4.13	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.70	4.22	4.19	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.30	4.03	4.10	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.75	4.48	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.28	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.75	4.38	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	652/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	710/1172	4.25	4.14	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	856/1182	3.75	4.29	4.35	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170		4.34		4.52	5.00
- 1														
Laboratory	•	0	_	•	0	0	-	F 00	1 / 100	F 00	4 54	4 2 4	4 00	F 00
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	1/ 189	5.00	4.74	4.34	4.82	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 192	5.00	4.68	4.34	4.79	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 186	5.00	4.70	4.48	4.73	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 187	4.75	4.67	4.33	4.67	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified			O	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 168	4.88	4.48	4.20	4.55	5.00
Frequ	ency.	Dist	rib	atior	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	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	0	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_	•	
				_	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 656 1 University of Maryland Title Plant Molecular Biolog

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 202

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

Grad.

1

3.50-4.00

1

F

Ρ

Ι

0

0

0

0

Lu,Hua

					Frequencies						-		ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.38	4.67
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	685/1402	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.29	4.33
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	529/1358	4.33	4.09	4.11	4.26	4.33
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.13	4.14	4.34	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	/ expla	ained	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.25	4.00
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How wou	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.03	4.10	4.21	5.00
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	970/1387	4.33	4.48	4.46	4.51	4.33
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.43	4.67
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.38	4.32	4.38	4.67
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.14	4.02	4.02	5.00
		Discus	ni on															
1 Did als	ace diea			what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.14	4.15	4.32	4.50
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182		4.29	4.35	4.46	5.00
		-	_	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1170		4.34	4.38	4.52	5.00
		echniques succes		a open arboabbion	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	423/ 800		4.20	4.06	4.10	4.00
				D		. 54												
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribi	utior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons							Туре			Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	- – – – S	0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														

Electives

Other

2

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 750 01 Title

Organismic Biology

Instructor: Lin,Weihong

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 203 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Onestion	naire

		NA		requencies		5	_	Instructor		Course Dept Mean Mean		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	254/1447	4.80	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	911/1447	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.27	4.24	4.29	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1358	4.80	4.09	4.11	4.26	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	128/1316	4.80	4.13	4.14	4.34	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1155/1447	4.40	4.75	4.69	4.74	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.03	4.10	4.21	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.48	4.46	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.38	4.32	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.14	4.02	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1172	4.80	4.14	4.15	4.32	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1182	4.80	4.29	4.35	4.46	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	581/ 800	3.75	4.20	4.06	4.10	3.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	58/ 66	4.00	4.00	4.58	4.71	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	53/ 62	4.00	4.00	4.56	4.69	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	33/ 58	4.50	4.50	4.41	4.75	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	37/ 65	4.50	4.50	4.42	4.64	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	54/ 64	3.50	3.50	4.09	4.18	3.50

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