Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101

CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Title Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL

Enrollment: 301 Questionnaires: 273 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 124 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	-1	0	1 77	1 17	<b>6</b> F	٥٦	0.0	2 77	1057/1504	2 77	4 20	4 07	4 12	2 77
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	17 12	17	65	85	88		1257/1504		4.39	4.27	4.13	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	1	16	15 20		104	85 108		1154/1503		4.23	4.20 4.28	$4.16 \\ 4.19$	3.86 3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1 3	52	28	23	44 64				1013/1290		4.18 4.08	4.28		3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5∠ 10	28 13	23 10	46	64	39 113	4.03	1359/1453 725/1421		3.99	4.21	4.11 3.91	3.29 4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	57	13 47	37	43	44	39				3.88	4.00	3.91	2.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	3	20	33	62	68	82		1306/1365 1246/1485		4.14	4.16	4.13	3.60
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> <li>How many times was class cancelled</li> </ol>	3	1	∠∪ 1	33	62 1		262		329/1504		4.14	4.16	4.13	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		2	23	24	70	82	28		1316/1483		4.90	4.06	3.97	3.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	44	4	43	24	70	02	⊿0	3.30	1310/1403	3.30	4.05	4.00	3.97	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	7	8	27	65	159	4.36	951/1425	4.36	4.47	4.41	4.36	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	5	4	23	42	193	4.55	1089/1426	4.55	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	15	29	56	94	73	3.68	1197/1418	3.68	4.28	4.25	4.20	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	32	35	47	71	82	3.51	1248/1416	3.51	4.32	4.26	4.21	3.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	27	23	59	69	86	3.62	876/1199	3.62	4.13	3.97	3.82	3.62
Discussion	1.0	0	2.1	1 17	г 1	<i>c</i> o	0.6	2 60	027/1210	2 (0	4 00	4 00	2 60	2 (0
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	31 4	17	51	62	96	3.68	937/1312		4.09	4.00	3.69	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	-	_	15 12	28		143	4.28	776/1303		4.39	4.24	3.93	4.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	8	15	34 49		125	4.17	855/1299		4.29	4.25	3.94	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	18	11	21	12	49	62	97	3.82	493/ 758	3.82	3.90	4.01	3.80	3.82
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	261	5	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	264	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	263	3	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	262	3	1	2	0	1	4	3.63	****/ 225	***	4.71	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	263	5	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	262	4	1	1	1	1	3	3 57	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	264	4	1	1	1	1	1		****/ 70		4.50	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	264	6	2	0	0	0	1		****/ 67		5.00	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	264	0	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	****/ 76		5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	264	1	2	2	1	1	2		****/ 73		5.00	4.17	3.83	***
•														
Field Work	266	0	-1	-1	2	-1	-1	2 00	++++/	++++	F 00	4 42	2 (2	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	266	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	****/ 58		5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	266	0 1	1	1	3 1	1	1 1		****/ 56 ****/ 44		5.00	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	267 266	3	2 2	0	1	1	0	2.80	****/ 44 ****/ 47		5.00	4.65	4.60 4.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		<i>3</i> 5	1	2	0 T	0 T	0		,			4.29	4.00 5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	265	5	Τ	۷	U	U	U	1.0/	****/ 39		4.50	4.44	5.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	265	0	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	***

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	264	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	264	3	2	1	1	1	1	2.67 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	265	1	1	2	1	2	1	3.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	265	1	2	0	1	1	3	3.43 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 273

Enrollment:

SOKOLOVE, PHILL 301

Spring 2005

Page 124 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	103	0.00-0.99	4	А	93	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	72
28-55	61	1.00-1.99	2	В	86						
56-83	16	2.00-2.99	37	С	70	General	8	Under-grad 2	273	Non-major	201
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	57	D	7						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	70	F	2	Electives	8	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	213	-			
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101

13

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 13

CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR

SOKOLOVE, PHILL (Instr. A)

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 125 Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	-	ncies	5			ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	609/1504	4.46	4.39	4.27	4.13	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	1	4	3.62	1267/1503	3.62	4.23	4.20	4.16	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	4	1	2	2	3.00	1236/1290	3.00	4.18	4.28	4.19	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	4	1	4	3.45	1307/1453	3.45	4.08	4.21	4.11	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	3	8	4.15	633/1421	4.15	3.99	4.00	3.91	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	3.88	4.08	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	6	2	2	1	2.67	1440/1485	2.67	4.14	4.16	4.13	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	525/1504	4.92	4.90	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1483	3.50	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	3.83	4.47	4.41	4.36	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1418	3.67	4.28	4.25	4.20	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1416	4.00	4.32	4.26	4.21	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1199	****	4.13	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	4	5	3.83	858/1312	3.83	4.09	4.00	3.69	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	0	1	9	4.33	737/1303	4.33	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.29	4.25	3.94	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	722/ 758	2.75	3.90	4.01	3.80	2.75

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101

CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR

KLOETZEL, JOHN (Instr. B)

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 126 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 13

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	609/1504	4.46	4.39	4.27	4.13	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	1	4	3.62	1267/1503	3.62	4.23	4.20	4.16	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	4	1	2	2	3.00	1236/1290	3.00	4.18	4.28	4.19	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	4	1	4	3.45	1307/1453	3.45	4.08	4.21	4.11	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	3	8	4.15	633/1421	4.15	3.99	4.00	3.91	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	3.88	4.08	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	6	2	2	1	2.67	1440/1485	2.67	4.14	4.16	4.13	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	525/1504	4.92	4.90	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	3	2	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1238/1425	3.83	4.47	4.41	4.36	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1201/1418	3.67	4.28	4.25	4.20	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.32	4.26	4.21	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1199	****	4.13	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	4	5	3.83	858/1312	3.83	4.09	4.00	3.69	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	0	1	9	4.33	737/1303	4.33	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.29	4.25	3.94	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	722/ 758	2.75	3.90	4.01	3.80	2.75

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA CLAASSEN, LARK

altimore Count Spring 2005 Page 127
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 175 Questionnaires: 159

Title

Instructor:

				Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	8	15	26	60	48	3 80	1248/1504	3.80	4.39	4.27	4.13	3.80
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	3	23	75	53	4.10	996/1503	4.10	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.10
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	13	29	55	57	3.94	996/1290		4.18	4.28	4.19	3.94
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	10	33	59	53		1021/1453	3.98	4.08	4.21	4.11	3.98
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	5	7	24	37	79	4.17	614/1421	4.17	3.99	4.00	3.91	4.17
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	13	14	27	54	47		1046/1365		3.88	4.08	3.96	3.70
	Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	13	26	44	70	4.08	953/1485		4.14	4.16	4.13	4.08
	How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0		131	4.85	760/1504		4.90	4.69	4.66	4.85
	-	27	3	6	6	64	47	6	3.32	1310/1483	3.32	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.32
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	27	55	70	4.23	1050/1425	4.23	4.47	4.41	4.36	4.23
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	12	36	60	46		1346/1426		4.67	4.69	4.56	3.89
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	6	35	67	44		1047/1418	3.96	4.28	4.25	4.20	3.96
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	12	13	19	32	35	42		1241/1416	3.52	4.32	4.26	4.21	3.52
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	9	16	42	39	39		894/1199		4.13	3.97		3.57
	Discussion														
1	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	75	0	11	9	19	20	25	3 16	1027/1312	3.46	4.09	4.00	3.69	3.46
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	75 79	0	11	10	19	20	20		1149/1303		4.39	4.24	3.93	3.40
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	80	0	14	12	16	19	18		1177/1299		4.29	4.25	3.94	3.19
	Were special techniques successful	80	33	5	8	9	13		3.37			3.90	4.01	3.80	3.37
т.	were special tecimiques successful	80	33	J	O	9	13	11	3.37	023/ 730	3.37	3.90	4.01	3.00	3.37
	Laboratory														
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	2	4	10	49	73	4.36	98/ 233	4.36	4.59	4.09	3.90	4.36
	Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	2	3	6	36	91	4.53	79/ 244		4.62	4.09	4.07	4.53
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	1	1	4		106	4.70	70/ 227		4.74	4.40	4.24	4.70
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	14	33	89	4.55	97/ 225		4.71	4.23		4.55
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	3	4	17	30	84	4.36	75/ 207	4.36	4.50	4.09	4.01	4.36
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	144	2	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	***
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	144	5	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.43	***
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	145	5	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.88	***
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	145	4	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	***
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	146	3	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	3.83	****
	Field Work														
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	150	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	***
2.	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	149	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.11	***
	Was the instructor available for consultation	148	3	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.60	***
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	150	4	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.00	***
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	151	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 39	***	4.50	4.44	5.00	****
	Self Paced									****/ 40					

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	147	2	0	0	2	1	7	4.50 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	148	4	0	0	1	0	6	4.71 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	148	1	0	2	2	2	4	3.80 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	148	1	0	1	1	1	7	4.40 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101

Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA

Instructor:

CLAASSEN, LARK

Enrollment: 175 Questionnaires: 159 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 127 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	55	0.00-0.99	1	А	75	Required for Majors	13	 Graduate	0	Major	76
28-55	44	1.00-1.99	0	В	61						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	21	С	10	General	1	Under-grad	159	Non-major	83
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	39	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	55	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	133				
				?	4						

Course-Section: BIOL 106 0101 Title

THE HUMAN ORGANISM

HANSON, FRANK E

Enrollment: 125 Questionnaires: 64

Instructor:

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 128 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	eaue	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	-			Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	8	3	15	20	16	3.53	1343/1504	3.53	4.39	4.27	4.13	3.53
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	9	17	21	11	3.42	1344/1503	3.42	4.23	4.20	4.16	3.42
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	8	10	22	17	3.61	1127/1290	3.61	4.18	4.28	4.19	3.61
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	41	3	3	5	5	5	3.29	1359/1453	3.29	4.08	4.21	4.11	3.29
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	2	5	10	13	25	3.98	768/1421	3.98	3.99	4.00	3.91	3.98
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	45	8	1	1	3	3	2.50	1347/1365	2.50	3.88	4.08	3.96	2.50
	Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	4	3	6	16		4.10	938/1485	4.10	4.14	4.16	4.13	4.10
	How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	4	56	4.93	460/1504		4.90	4.69	4.66	4.93
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	5	4	21	16	6	3.27	1324/1483	3.27	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.27
-	Lecture			-		_		2.4	4 25	051/1405	4 05	4 45	4 4 7	4 26	4 05
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	6	17			951/1425		4.47	4.41	4.36	4.35
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	8	16	36		1183/1426	4.43	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.43
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	8	8	19	21		1163/1418	3.75	4.28	4.25	4.20	3.75
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	6	13	12	25		1126/1416		4.32	4.26	4.21	3.85
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	4	4	16	15	22	3.77	810/1199	3.77	4.13	3.97	3.82	3.77
	Discussion														
1	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	9	3	9	6	_	2 04	1194/1312	2 04	4 00	4.00	3.69	2.84
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	4	3	11	3	5 11			2.84 3.44	4.09 4.39	4.24	3.93	3.44
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32 32	0	6	1	9	3	13		1133/1303 1106/1299	3.50	4.39	4.25	3.93	3.44
	Were special techniques successful	32 32	22	1	4	2	0			****/ 758	****	3.90	4.25	3.80	****
4.	were special techniques successful	34	22	1	4	4	U	3	3.00	/ /36		3.90	4.01	3.00	
	Laboratory														
1	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	61	1	0	0	0	0	2	5 00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	3.90	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	61	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.07	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.24	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.01	****
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.01	***
٠.	more requirements for tax reports crediting appearance	0_	_	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	_	3.00	, 20.		1.50	1.05	2.02	
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.43	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.88	***
4.	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	***
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	3.83	***
	Field Work														
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	***
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.11	***
	Was the instructor available for consultation	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.60	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.00	***
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	5.00	****
-	Self Paced	<i></i>			^	^	^	_	F 00		and the	4.4.4.4	4 50	4 50	ale ale de de
Ι.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	36	***	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 106 0101

Title THE HUMAN ORGANISM

Instructor: Enrollment: Questionnaires: 64

HANSON, FRANK E 125

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 128 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	45	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	2	В	15						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	7	C	22	General	4	Under-grad	64	Non-major	64
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	D	4						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	3	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 106H 0101

Title

Instructor: HANSON, FRANK

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 129 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.23	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.18	4.28	4.19	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	320/1421	4.50	3.99	4.00	3.91	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.88	4.08	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.14	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.47	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.28	4.25	4.20	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.32	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.13	3.97	3.82	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.09	4.00	3.69	5.00
Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.29	4.25	3.94	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	3.90	4.01	3.80	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		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	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General		Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 123 0101
Title HUMAN GENETICS
Instructor: GETHMANN, RICHA

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 130 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 60
Questionnaires: 39
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	2	3	12	18	4.31	813/1504	4.31	4.39	4.27	4.13	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	0	4	13	17	4.29	816/1503	4.29	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	9	22	4.49	534/1290	4.49	4.18	4.28	4.19	4.49
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	9	2	0	0	10	14	4.31	718/1453	4.31	4.08	4.21	4.11	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	3	1	6	6	13	3.86	895/1421	3.86	3.99	4.00	3.91	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	7	1	5	4	10	8	3.68	1059/1365	3.68	3.88	4.08	3.96	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	2	11	21	4.56	402/1485	4.56	4.14	4.16	4.13	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	5	10	13	4.29	602/1483	4.29	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	7	27	4.69	525/1425	4.69	4.47	4.41	4.36	4.69
	3	0	0	0	1	7	32	4.89	596/1426	4.86	4.47	4.41	4.56	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	4	9	22	4.44	656/1418	4.44	4.07	4.25	4.20	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	9	27	4.58	544/1416	4.58	4.20	4.25	4.20	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	<i>5</i>	17	1	1	4	2	2 / 9	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.13	3.97	3.82	4.00
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1/			4	۷	9	4.00	030/1199	4.00	4.13	3.91	3.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	2	4	13	4.29	572/1312	4.29	4.09	4.00	3.69	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	523/1303	4.57	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	0	7	13	4.52	556/1299	4.52	4.29	4.25	3.94	4.52
4. Were special techniques successful	18	15	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	3.80	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	В	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	10	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	2			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Spring 2005

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES

Enrollment: 93
Questionnaires: 68

Title

JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Page 131

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	6	0	0	0	1	6	55	4.87	153/1504	4.87	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	5	14	42	4.61	380/1503		4.23	4.20	4.18	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	7	13	42	4.56	450/1290	4.56	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	7	2	6	10	18	17	3.79	1172/1453	3.79	4.08	4.21	4.20	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	7	1	1	5	19	27	4.32	489/1421	4.32	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	3	11	2	17	15	14	3.32	1229/1365	3.32	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	2	2	14	44	4.61	339/1485	4.61	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	48	14	4.23	1294/1504	4.23	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	0	25	27	4.52	330/1483	4.52	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	6	13	43	4.60	676/1425	4.60	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	61	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	7	18	37	4.48	604/1418	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	8	53	4.84	221/1416	4.84	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	17	0	0	7	9	29	4.49	290/1199	4.49	4.13	3.97	3.95	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	51	0	2	0	3	5	7	3.88	826/1312	3.88	4.09	4.00	3.98	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	2	1	1	2	12	4.17	851/1303	4.17	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	50	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.21	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	49	14	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 758	***	3.90	4.01	3.89	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	66	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	***	4.59	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	66	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.24	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	66	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	***	4.74	4.40	4.58	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	66	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 225	***	4.71	4.23	4.52	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	67	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons		Type		Major	ŝ
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	в 36						

56-83	18	2.00-2.99	10	С	6	General	4	Under-grad	67	Non-major	60
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	20	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there a	are not enougl	n
				P	0			responses to	be sigr	nificant	
				I	0	Other	53				
				?	2						

ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 132 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 14

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Out and down	NTD	27.2		_	ncies	5	_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	- <del>4</del> 	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	455/1504	4.75	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	258/1503	4.66	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	290/1290	4.69	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	0	8	4.00	1001/1453	4.21	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	320/1421	4.65	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	2	5	3.43	1191/1365	3.74	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	170/1485	4.65	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	525/1504	4.91	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	250/1483	4.07	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	331/1425	4.58	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	502/1426	4.44	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	191/1418	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1416	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	636/1199	4.18	4.13	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1312	4.56	4.09	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/1303		4.39	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1299	4.35	4.29	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	4.80	3.90	4.01	3.89	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	4.64	51/ 233	4.82	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	4	o 7	4.64	51/ 233	4.83	4.59	4.09	4.24	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	57/ 227	4.85	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	70/ 225	4.80	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 207	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.22	****
3. Here requirements for tab reports creatry specifical	5		J	O	_	U	_	1.00	, 201	3.00	1.50	1.00	1,22	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	С	5	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				2	1						

ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

(Instr. B) Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 133 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 14

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies	;			ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	455/1504	4.75	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	258/1503	4.66	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	290/1290	4.69	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	0	8	4.00	1001/1453	4.21	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	320/1421	4.65	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	2	5	3.43	1191/1365	3.74	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	170/1485	4.65	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	525/1504	4.91	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	8	2	0	3.20	1340/1483	4.07	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1267/1425	4.58	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1356/1426	4.44	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1250/1418	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	0	2		1309/1416	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1199	4.18	4.13	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1312	4.56	4.09	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2			****/1303	4.81	4.39	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1			****/1299		4.29	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	4.80	3.90	4.01	3.89	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	51/ 233	4.82	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	58/ 244	4.83	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	57/ 227	4.85	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	70/ 225	4.80	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 207	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.22	****
J. HOLD INTERIOR FOR THE TOPOLOGO CICALLY SPECIFICA	5	,	J	J	_	J	-	1.00	, 201	3.00	1.55	1.00	1.22	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-		_	
				?	1						

Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES

Enrollment: 19

Spring 2005

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 134 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

	<u> </u>				Inst	structor 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	13	5.00	1/1504	4.75	4.39	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	145/1503	4.66	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	173/1290	4.69	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	152/1453	4.21	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	112/1421	4.65	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	742/1365	3.74	3.88	4.08	4.00	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	78/1485	4.65	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	525/1504	4.91	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	635/1483	4.07	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	209/1425	4.58	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.44	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	233/1418	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	296/1416	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1199	4.18	4.13	3.97	3.95	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1312	4.56	4.09	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	4.81	4.39	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	4.35	4.29	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	4.80	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 233	4.82	4.59	4.09	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 244	4.83	4.62	4.09	4.24	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 227	4.85	4.74	4.40	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 225	4.80	4.71	4.23	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 207	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.22	****

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				Ş	0						

ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 135 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 22

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				_	ncies				ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	306/1504	4.75	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	414/1503	4.66	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	290/1290	4.69	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	12	4.27	752/1453	4.21	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	182/1421	4.65	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	9	3	8	3.86	935/1365	3.74	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	339/1485	4.65	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1504	4.91	4.90	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	7	9	4.14	762/1483	4.07	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.97
Lecture	_		_	_		_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	541/1425	4.58	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	4	4	7		1313/1426	4.44	4.67	4.69	4.71	3.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	964/1418	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	871/1416	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	9	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	574/1199	4.18	4.13	3.97	3.95	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	364/1312	4.56	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	4.81	4.39	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.35	4.29	4.25	4.21	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 758	4.80	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	31/ 233	4.82	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	23/ 244	4.83	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.87
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	64/ 227	4.85	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	81/ 225	4.80	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	9	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 207	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.22	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	า									

Credits Ea	edits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Title

ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance

5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified

/T | D

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 22

Spring 2005
Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 136

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 22 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 4 16 4.71 306/1504 4.75 4.39 1 0 0 0 4.27 4.26 4.71 4.20 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 14 4.57 414/1503 4.66 4.23 4.18 4.57 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 2 17 4.71 290/1290 4.69 4.18 4.28 4.27 4.71 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Ω Ω 12 4.27 752/1453 4.21 4.08 4.21 Ω 4.20 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 17 4.71 182/1421 4.65 3.99 4.00 3.90 4.71 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 8 3.86 935/1365 3.74 3.88 4.08 4.00 3.86 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 1 6 14 4.62 339/1485 4.65 4.14 4.16 4.15 4.62 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 5.00 1/1504 4.91 4.90 4.69 4.68 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 4 3.81 1082/1483 4.07 4.05 4.06 4.02 3.97 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 10 0 0 0 2 1 9 4.58 688/1425 4.58 4.47 4.41 4.40 4.64 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9 0 0 1 5 3.92 1339/1426 4.44 4.67 4.69 4.71 3.99 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 Ω 5 3.92 1081/1418 4.30 4.28 4.25 4.22 4.02 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 1 2 6 3.77 1162/1416 4.33 4.32 4.26 4.24 4.01 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 7 3 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1199 4.18 4.13 3.97 3.95 4.14 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 4 4.50 364/1312 4.56 4.09 4.00 3.98 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 16 0 0 6 5.00 1/1303 4.81 4.39 4.24 4.23 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 16 0 0 5 4.83 273/1299 4.35 4.29 4.25 4.21 2 4 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 758 4.80 3.90 4.01 3.89 4. Were special techniques successful 16 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 31/ 233 4.82 4.59 4.09 4.30 4.80 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 7 0 2 13 4.87 23/ 244 4.83 4.62 4.09 4.24 4.87 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0 0 1 2 13 4.75 64/ 227 6 4.85 4.74 4.40 4.58 4.75

#### Frequency Distribution

0

0

0

0

0

1

3 11 4.67

6 5.00

81/ 225 4.80

4.71 4.23 4.52 4.67

1/ 207 5.00 4.50 4.09 4.22 5.00

7

7 9

Credits Ea	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected			d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-	•		
				?	1						

ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor: Enrollment:

Title

FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)

Spring 2005 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 137

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires: 20 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 3 17 4.85 168/1504 4.75 4.39 4.27 4.26 4.85 0 0 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4 14 4.60 380/1503 4.66 4.23 4.20 4.18 4.60 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 5 13 4.55 459/1290 4.69 4.18 4.28 4.27 4.55 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Ω 1 0 9 4.05 974/1453 4.21 4.08 4.21 Ω 4.20 4.05 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 5 13 4.63 229/1421 4.65 3.99 4.00 3.90 4.63 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 6 3.75 1003/1365 3.74 3.88 4.08 4.00 3.75 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 Ω 7 10 4.42 563/1485 4.65 4.14 4.16 4.15 4.42 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 4 16 4.80 830/1504 4.91 4.90 4.69 4.68 4.80 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 1 12 4 4.18 720/1483 4.07 4.05 4.06 4.02 4.24 Lecture 2 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 5 13 4.72 474/1425 4.58 4.47 4.41 4.40 4.71 0 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 3 13 4.61 1036/1426 4.44 4.67 4.69 4.71 4.73 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 4 12 4.56 514/1418 4.30 4.28 4.25 4.22 4.47 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 4 14 4.78 296/1416 4.33 4.32 4.26 4.24 4.74 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 8 0 4 3.90 748/1199 4.18 4.13 3.97 3.95 3.87 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6 4.63 283/1312 4.56 4.09 4.00 3.98 4.63 12 0 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 6 4.63 488/1303 4.81 4.39 4.24 4.23 4.63 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 1 3 3.88 1008/1299 4.35 4.29 4.25 4.21 3.88 4. Were special techniques successful 12 3 4 4.80 84/758 4.80 3.90 4.01 3.89 4.80 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 0 1 11 4.92 23/ 233 4.82 4.59 4.09 4.30 4.92 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 8 1 11 4.92 18/ 244 4.83 4.62 4.09 4.24 4.92 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 0 0 1 11 4.92 37/ 227 4.85 8 4.74 4.40 4.58 4.92 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 8 0 0 0 1 11 4.92 33/ 225 4.80 4.71 4.23 4.52 4.92 7 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 8 5 5.00 1/ 207 5.00 4.50 4.09 4.22 5.00 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 58 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.43 4.41 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 19 0 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 56 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.23 4.24 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 19 Ω 44 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.65 4.51 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 40 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.53 4.44 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 Frequency Distribution C

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	17	
				2	1			

ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB

Instructor: (Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 138 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 20

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	NTD	272		equei		S	_		ructor	Course	_			Sect
Questions	NR 	NA	1	2	3	- 4 	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	168/1504	4.75	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	380/1503	4.66	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	459/1290	4.69	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	9	4.05	974/1453	4.21	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	229/1421	4.65	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	6	6		1003/1365	3.74	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	563/1485		4.14	4.16	4.15	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	830/1504	4.91	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	567/1483	4.07	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	525/1425	4.58	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	643/1426	4.44	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	727/1418	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	407/1416	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	780/1199	4.18	4.13	3.97	3.95	3.87
Pianonia														
Discussion	1 2	0	0	0	1	1	6	1 62	202/1212	1 E C	4 00	4 00	2 00	1 62
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12 12	0	0	0	1 1	1	6 6	4.63	283/1312 488/1303	4.56 4.81	4.09	$4.00 \\ 4.24$	3.98 4.23	4.63 4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	3			1008/1299	4.35	4.29	4.25	4.23	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	1	_	4.80	84/ 758				3.89	
IN HOLO SPOOLAL COOMILAGOS SACCOSSIAL			Ü	Ü	Ū	_	-	1.00	01, ,00	1.00	3.70		3.05	1.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1		4.92	23/ 233	4.82	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	18/ 244	4.83	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	37/ 227	4.85		4.40	4.58	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0 7	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	33/ 225	4.80		4.23		4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	/	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 207	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.22	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	***	5.00	4.65	4.51	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	***	****	4.53	4.44	****
		ŭ	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	Ü	-	3.00	, 10			1.00		
Enorg	0000	Diat	i h	.+	_									

Credits Earned Cum. GPA				Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 7	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	17	
				2	1			

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 139
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 166
Questionnaires: 73

				Frequencies			S	Instructor			Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	4	11	30	26		1052/1504		4.39	4.27	4.26	4.10
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	6	19	35	11		1226/1503	3.72	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.72
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	8	25	28	10		1140/1290		4.18	4.28	4.27	3.56
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	50	0	3	6	6	6		1209/1453	3.71	4.08	4.21	4.20	3.71
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	6	12	22	15	12		1249/1421	3.22	3.99	4.00	3.90	3.22
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	56	0	2	5	4	3		****/1365	****	3.88	4.08	4.00	****
	Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	3	13	19	32	4.06	,		4.14	4.16	4.15	4.06
	How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	65	4.93	,		4.90	4.69	4.68	4.93
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	3	16	31	13	3.81	1082/1483	3.75	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.75
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	12	26	31	4.17	1094/1425	4.41	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.41
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	13	54	4.69	926/1426	4.73	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	8	17	28	16		1197/1418	3.92	4.28	4.25	4.22	3.92
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	5	9	22	35	4.23	896/1416	4.34	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.34
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	6	13	25			766/1199			3.97		3.94
		_	-	_	_					,					
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	54	0	3	4	3	6	3	3.11	1131/1312	3.11	4.09	4.00	3.98	3.11
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	55	0	3	2	6	3	4	3.17	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.23	****
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	55	0	3	2	2	6	5	3.44	****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.21	****
4.	Were special techniques successful	55	14	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
	T all assat assa														
1	Laboratory	<i>C</i> 1	0	0	1	2	2	_	1 17	++++/ 022	****	4 50	4 00	4 20	****
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	61	0	•	1	2	3	6		****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	4.30	****
	Were you provided with adequate background information	61	1	0	0	0	6 3	0	4.50	****/ 244	****	4.62 4.74	4.09	4.24	****
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61 61	1	0	0	1	4	8		****/ 227	****		4.40	4.58	****
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	1	1	0	2	3	6 5		****/ 225 ****/ 207	****	4.71 4.50	4.23	4.52 4.22	****
э.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	01	1	Т	U	۷	3	5	4.00	***/ 207		4.50	4.09	4.22	
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	70	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	70	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	70	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
4.	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	70	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	70	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	***	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
	Field Work														
1	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	0	0	1	2	4 67	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	70	0	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
	. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria . Was the instructor available for consultation			0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
	. Was the instructor available for consultation  1. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations			1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.65	****
	4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities			1	0	0	0	2		****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
٥.	224 Compared their you carry out richa accivities	70	0	_	J	J	J		5.07	, 37		1.50		1.20	
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	***	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	70	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/	35	****	***	4.49	4.50	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	70	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67 ****/	36	****	***	4.60	4.13	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	70	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	70	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	***

Course-Section: BIOL 275 0101
Title MICROBIOLOGY
Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 139 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 166

Questionnaires: 73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	larned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	В	26						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	С	22	General	2	Under-grad	73	Non-major	63
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	20	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	57	_			
				?	2						

(Instr. B)

Baltimore County Spring 2005

University of Maryland Page 140 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 166 Questionnaires: 73

Instructor:

			Fr	eque	encie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	4	11	30	26	4.10	1052/1504	4.10	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	6	19	35	11	3.72	1226/1503	3.72	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	8	25	28	10	3.56	1140/1290	3.56	4.18	4.28	4.27	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	50	0	3	6	6	6	3.71	1209/1453	3.71	4.08	4.21	4.20	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	6	12	22	15	12	3.22	1249/1421	3.22	3.99	4.00	3.90	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	56	0	2	5	4	3	3.57	****/1365	***	3.88	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	3	13	19	32	4.06	964/1485	4.06	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	65	4.93	525/1504	4.93	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	1	21	27	6	3.69	1157/1483	3.75	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	3	14	42	4.66	572/1425			4.41	4.40	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	2	9	47	4.78	790/1426	4.73	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	0	9	26	22	4.17	922/1418	3.92	4.28	4.25	4.22	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	5	18	34	4.45	701/1416	4.34	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	4	1	2	9	23	17	4.02	632/1199	3.94	4.13	3.97	3.95	3.94
Discussion	<b>-</b> 4	0	2	4	2	_	2	2 11	1121/1210	2 11	4 00	4 00	2 00	2 11
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	54	0	3	4	3	6	3		1131/1312		4.09	4.00	3.98	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	55	0	3	2	6	3	4	3.17	****/1303	***	4.39	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	55	0	3 1	2	2 1	6	5		****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	55	14	Т	U	Τ	1	1	3.25	****/ 758	^ ^ ^ ^	3.90	4.01	3.89	^ ^ ^ ^
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	61	0	0	1	2	3	6	1 17	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	61	0	0	0	0	6	6		****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	1	0	0	0	3	8		****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	1	0	0	1	4	6		****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	1	1	0	2	3	5		****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.22	****
J. Were requirements for tab reports crearry specified	01	_	_	O		3	5	1.00	, 207		1.50	1.00	1.22	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	70	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	70	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 70	***	4.50	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	70	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	***	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	70	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	70	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	***	5.00	4.43	4.41	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	70	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	70	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	***	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	70	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.65	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	70	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	***
Self Paced		_		_	_									
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	70	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00 ****/	35	****	***	4.49	4.50	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	70	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67 ****/	36	****	***	4.60	4.13	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	70	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	70	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	***

Course-Section: BIOL 275 0101 University of Maryland Page 140 Title MICROBIOLOGY Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 166
Questionnaires: 73

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Spring 2005

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	В	26						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	22	General	2	Under-grad	73	Non-major	63
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	20	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	57	_		-	
				?	2						

BIOL 275L 0101 University of Maryland MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR Baltimore County

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 141

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

	Questions				equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1	General Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	788/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.33
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	8		1027/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.05
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	832/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.19
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	10	7	4.10	947/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.10
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	8	5	7	3.95	804/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	3.95
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	4	6	6	3.79	981/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.79
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	5	8	3.81	1146/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	3.81
	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	940/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.71
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	1009/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.38
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	1147/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	3.44
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1008/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.63
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	5	4	8	3.89	1102/1418	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.22	3.89
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	7	7	3.95	1071/1416	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.24	3.95
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	815/1199	3.87	4.13	3.97	3.95	3.77
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	716/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.00
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	881/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.11
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1004/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	3.89
4.	Were special techniques successful	12	2	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	563/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	3.57
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	109/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.30
	Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	107/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.40
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	76/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.68
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	83/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.65
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	3	1	5	4	6	3.47	169/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	3.47
	Seminar														
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	***
2.		19	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
	Field Work														
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 58	***	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4.	9 1 1	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.30	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.65	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	***	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	***

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 21

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 141 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	A	 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				2	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR (Instr. B)

Baltimore County Spring 2005 Page 142 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 21

Title

Instructor:

	Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1	General	0	0	0	1	2	_	1.0	4 22	700/1504	4 27	4 20	4 07	4 06	4 22
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5 8	12 8	4.33	788/1504	4.37		4.27	4.26	4.33
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	-	2	3	U	8		1027/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.05 4.19
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	-	4	9	-	4.19	832/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1 1	1 0	0	2	10	7 7	4.10	947/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.10
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0			0	8	5	•	3.95	804/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	3.95
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	4	6	6	3.79	981/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.79
	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	5	8		1146/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	3.81
8.	•	0	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	940/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.71
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1405/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.38
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1394/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	3.44
2.		16	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.63
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	1	1	1	1		****/1418	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.22	3.89
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	****/1416	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.24	3.95
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	4	0	0	1	0	0		****/1199			3.97		3.77
	Discussion		_		_	_		_							
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	716/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.00
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	881/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.11
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	2	4		1004/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	3.89
4.	Were special techniques successful	12	2	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	563/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	3.57
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	109/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.30
	Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	107/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.40
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	76/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.68
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	83/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.65
	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	3	1	5	4	6	3.47	169/ 207		4.50	4.09	4.22	3.47
-	Seminar	1.0	•	•		•	•	_	2 50		4.4.4.4	- 00	4 63	4 00	****
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	0.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2.		19	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
	Field Work														
1.	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2.	-	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4.		19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.65	****
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
	. 16 -														
1	Self Paced	1.0	0	0	1	0	0	-1	2 50	++++/ 40	****	++++	4 52	1 11	****
⊥.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	Τ	3.50	****/ 40	^ ~ <del>~</del> ~	^ ^ * *	4.53	4.44	^ ^ * *

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	***

Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 21

(Instr. B)

Page 142 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_		-	
				?	0						

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAME Enrollment: 23

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 143 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1						ructor	Course	_			Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	981/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	928/1503		4.23	4.20	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	800/1290		4.18	4.28	4.27	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	1001/1453		4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	827/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1003/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	1104/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	460/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	433/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1076/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	967/1426		4.67	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	905/1418		4.28	4.25	4.22	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	921/1416		4.32	4.26	4.24	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	403/1199	3.87	4.13	3.97	3.95	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	826/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	881/1303		4.39	4.24	4.23	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	922/1299		4.29	4.25	4.21	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	56/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	107/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	41/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	51/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	79/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	****/ 76		5.00	4.61	4.22	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	***	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	***	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	***	4.53	4.44	***

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	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	17				
				?	0						

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR Bal

SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 22

Title

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 144
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	COLLEGA	Production	Ouestionnaire

			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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	594/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	751/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	758/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	563/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	459/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	717/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	990/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	591/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	784/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	738/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	617/1418	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	574/1416	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	636/1199	3.87	4.13	3.97	3.95	4.14
J. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	-	U	_	J	5	,	1.00	030/1199	3.07	1.13	3.91	3.93	7.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	592/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	488/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	798/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	92/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	48/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	98/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	76/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	84/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	4.31
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	1	0		****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
J. Were Criteria for grading made crear	20	U	U	_	U		U	3.00	/ /3		3.00	4.1/	1.21	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	***	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
0-151														
Self Paced  1 Did celf paced gystem centribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	****/ 40	****	***	4.53	4.44	***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	۷۷	U	U	U	U	۷	U	4.00	/ 40			4.53	4.44	

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Title

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor:

SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 24

Page 144 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 22

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

(Instr. B)

Page 145 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 22

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	anier	ncies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1. I	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	594/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.48
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	751/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. I	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	758/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.29
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	563/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.42
5. I	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	459/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.35
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	717/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	4.11
	Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	990/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.00
	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. I	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	433/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.36
	Lecture														
1 1	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	603/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.57
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	995/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.72
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	4		4.71	317/1418	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.59
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	209/1416	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.70
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	471/1199		4.13	3.97		4.14
J. 1	ord address that teermiques emidnee your anderstanding		O	O	_	O		-	1.20	17171100	3.07	1.13	3.77	3.73	1.11
	Discussion														
1. I	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	592/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.25
2. V	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	488/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.63
3. I	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	798/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	4.25
4. V	Were special techniques successful	14	5	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
	T albanahanna														
1 т	Laboratory	0	0	0	0	1	_	_	4 20	00/ 000	1 11	4 50	4 00	4 20	4 20
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9 9	0	0	0 0	1 1	6 2	6 10	4.38	92/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.38
	Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.69	48/ 244 98/ 227	4.53 4.64	4.62 4.74	4.09 4.40	4.24 4.58	4.69 4.62
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	10		/					
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.69	76/ 225		4.71	4.23	4.52	4.69
5. V	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	U	U	U	3	3	/	4.31	84/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	4.31
	Seminar														
1. 7	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. V	Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	***
3. I	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 67	***	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. I	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	***	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. V	Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 73	***	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
	Field Work														
1 т	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	Ο	3.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 56	***	5.00	4.43	4.24	***
	Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	***	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	***	5.00	4.29	4.65	****
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 39	***	4.50	4.44	4.03	****
J. 1	or conferences help you carry out freta activities	20	_	1	J	J	5	U	1.00	, 39		1.50	1.11	1.20	
	Self Paced														
1. I	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 145 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Title

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

24 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Page 146 Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029 Spring 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	8	13	4.50	549/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	707/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	766/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	844/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	532/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	603/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	5	8	3.86	1110/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	329/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	10	7	4.14	751/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	724/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	825/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	754/1418	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	829/1416	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	919/1199	3.87		3.97	3.95	3.50
_, _														
Discussion	10		•	•		_	_	4 55		4 06	4 00	4 00	2 22	***
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/1312		4.09	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	60/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.58
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	50/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.68
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	120/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	39/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	3	5	8	3.95	122/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	3.95
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.65	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	***	4.50	4.44	4.28	***
Solf Dogod														
Self Paced  1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	***
1. 21a Sell pacea System contribute to what you reallied		3	5	J	5	_	J	1.00	, 10			1.55		

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 146 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 22

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_		_	
				?	1						

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Spring 2005

Page 147 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

		, ,			-1 3	
Enrollment:	24					
Questionnaires:	22		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	8	13	4.50	549/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	707/1503		4.23	4.20	4.18	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	766/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	844/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	532/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	603/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	5	8	3.86	1110/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	329/1504		4.90	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	1	11	5	4.00	850/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	1165/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	995/1426		4.67	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	2	1	4	7		947/1418		4.28	4.25	4.22	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31			4.32	4.26	4.24	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	9	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/1199	3.87	4.13	3.97	3.95	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	***
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	60/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.58
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	50/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.68
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	120/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	39/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	3	5	8	3.95	122/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	3.95
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76		5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	***	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44		5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47		5.00	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor:

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 147 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 22

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	_			
				?	1						

Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

SANDOZ, JAMES W 18

Page 148 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	972/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	919/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	839/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	968/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	935/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	7	2	3.79	981/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	1	6	2	3.13	1374/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1052/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	679/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	1036/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1081/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	736/1418	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	1008/1416	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	6	2	3	3.31	997/1199	3.87	4.13	3.97	3.95	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	716/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	563/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	570/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	88/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	125/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	102/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	130/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.30
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	162/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	3.60
									. ,					

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_		_	
				2	0						

ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION

Title Instructor:

(Instr. A) LEIPS, JEFF

Enrollment: 262 Questionnaires: 113 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 149 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	-	0	-	_	1.0		4.0	4 10	001/1504	4 1 1	4 20	4 00	4 00	4 1 1
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	/	12	44	48	4.17	991/1504		4.39	4.27	4.27	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	16	45	44	4.12	981/1503	4.12	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	19	40	46	4.09	902/1290	4.09	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	73	6	3	5	18	7		1317/1453	3.44	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	6	11	31	32	26		1073/1421	3.58	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	78	5	7	7	6	6	3.03	1292/1365	3.03	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	3	19	34	51	4.18	842/1485	4.18	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	2	2	105	4.92	591/1504	4.92	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	2	1	1	23	45	18	3.89	1009/1483	4.06	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	7	22	81	4.62	649/1425	4.63	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	1	5	16	86	4.66	967/1426	4.73	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	15	26	64	4.32	790/1418	4.37	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	7	8	29	67	4.38	776/1416	4.47	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	0	2	9	22	66	4.54	253/1199	4.44	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	7	2	19	15	25	3.72	917/1312	3.72	4.09	4.00	4.09	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			3	3	16	15	33	4.03	905/1303	4.03	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	3	3	15	12	36	4.09	902/1299	4.09	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful			4	5	18	9	14	3.48	586/ 758	3.48	3.90	4.01	4.00	3.48

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons	Туре			Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	А	21	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	45
28-55	17	1.00-1.99	0	В	52						
56-83	18	2.00-2.99	15	С	14	General	3	Under-grad	113	Non-major	68
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	23	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	82				
				2	4						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101 Title

ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION

FREELAND, STEPH (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 262 Questionnaires: 113

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 150 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
a 1														
General	_	_	_	_										
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	./	12	44	48	4.17	991/1504	4.17	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	16	45	44	4.12	981/1503	4.12	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	19	40	46	4.09	902/1290	4.09	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	73	6	3	5	18	7	3.44	1317/1453	3.44	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	6	11	31	32	26	3.58	1073/1421	3.58	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	78	5	7	7	6	6	3.03	1292/1365	3.03	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	3	19	34	51	4.18	842/1485	4.18	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	2	2	105	4.92	591/1504	4.92	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	15	32	34	4.23	657/1483	4.06	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
	0	0	0	1	1	2.4	76	1 67	E70/140E	1 (2	4 47	1 11	1 12	4 (2
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	4	24	76	4.67	572/1425	4.63	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	Ţ	4	15	83	4.75	843/1426	4.73	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	2	9	31	62	4.47	617/1418	4.37	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	5	25	72	4.57	554/1416	4.47	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	9	1	4	8	17	64	4.48	300/1199	4.44	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	7	2	19	15	25	3.72	917/1312	3.72	4.09	4.00	4.09	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	3	3	16	15	33	4.03	905/1303	4.03	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			3	3	15	12	36	4.09	902/1299	4.09	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful			4	5	18	<u> </u>	14	3.48	586/ 758	3.48	3.90	4.01	4.00	3.48
T. MOTO SPECIAL CECILITYUES SUCCESSIUL	43	20	7	J	10	J	TI	3.40	300/ /30	3.40	3.50	-I.UI	1.00	3.40

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons	Туре			Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	А	21	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	45
28-55	17	1.00-1.99	0	В	52						
56-83	18	2.00-2.99	15	С	14	General	3	Under-grad	113	Non-major	68
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	23	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	82				
				2	4						

ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION

Instructor: (Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 151 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 262
Questionnaires: 113

Title

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	7	12	44	48	4.17	991/1504	4.17	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	16	45	44	4.12	981/1503	4.12	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	19	40	46	4.09	902/1290	4.09	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	73	6	3	5	18	7	3.44	1317/1453	3.44	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	6	11	31	32	26	3.58	1073/1421	3.58	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	78	5	7	7	6	6	3.03	1292/1365	3.03	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	3	19	34	51	4.18	842/1485	4.18	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	2	_	105	4.92	591/1504	4.92	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	2	1	2	16	35	29	4.07	810/1483	4.06	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	1	2	29	70	4.61	649/1425	4.63	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	4	11	87	4.78	790/1426		4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	6	11	24	60	4.33	772/1418		4.28	4.25	4.26	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	4	9	20	69	4.48	662/1416	4.47	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	13	2	5	7	23	51	4.32	446/1199	4.44	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	7	2	19	15	25	3.72	917/1312	3.72	4.09	4.00	4.09	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	3	3	16	15	33	4.03	905/1303	4.03	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	3	3	15	12	36	4.09	902/1299	4.09	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	43	20	4	5	18	9	14	3.48	586/ 758	3.48	3.90	4.01	4.00	3.48

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	А	21	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	45
28-55	17	1.00-1.99	0	В	52						
56-83	18	2.00-2.99	15	С	14	General	3	Under-grad	113	Non-major	68
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	23	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	82				
				?	4						

Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI

Instructor: BRADLEY, BRIAN (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 254 Questionnaires: 115 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 152 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncie 3	es 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	3	8	24	53	24	3.78	1257/1504	3.78	4.39	4.27	4.27	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	8	45	38	18		1294/1503		4.23	4.20	4.22	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	6	11	36	32	27		1140/1290		4.18	4.28	4.31	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	80	2	6	14	5	5		1385/1453		4.08	4.21	4.23	3.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	5	8	41	24	29		1061/1421		3.99	4.00	4.01	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	94	1	1	10	3	3		****/1365		3.88	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	3	21	25	59	4.21	818/1485		4.14	4.16	4.17	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	0	0	1	_		4.94			4.90	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	5	0	2	23	33	29	4.02	838/1483	3.40	4.05	4.06	4.08	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	4	22	42	39	4.03	1157/1425	3.99	4.47	4.41	4.43	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	5	12	36	56	4.28	1256/1426	4.15	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	4	9	24	40	31	3.79	1150/1418	3.33	4.28	4.25	4.26	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	5	8	20	34	42	3.92	1092/1416	3.34	4.32	4.26	4.27	3.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	33	6	11	17	15	25	3.57	898/1199	3.46	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	79	0	10	6	8	5	7	2 81	1200/1312	2.81	4.09	4.00	4.09	2.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	80	0	8	3	9	6	9		1185/1303		4.39	4.24	4.27	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	81	0	4	2	10	11	7		1126/1299		4.29	4.25	4.30	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	81	23	0	2	5	0	4		****/ 758		3.90	4.01	4.00	****
									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	110	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	, 200		4.59	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 244		4.62	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	111	2	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 227		4.74	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	111	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225		4.71	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.14	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	110	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	***	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	114	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	***	****	4.60	4.63	***
1		ŭ	ŭ	_	ŭ	·	Ü		, 30					

Credits Earned	Cum. GF	PA	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Major	`S
00-27 4 28-55 5	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	2 1		6 10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5

56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	С	5	General	1	Under-grad 115 Non-major 110
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	22	
				?	0			

University of Maryland Baltimore County

MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI (Instr. B)

Instructor: Enrollment: 254

Title

Spring 2005

JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Page 153

Questionnaires: 115	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	3	8	24	53	24	3.78	1257/1504	3.78	4.39	4.27	4.27	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	8	45	38	18	3.54	1294/1503	3.54	4.23	4.20	4.22	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	6	11	36	32	27	3.56	1140/1290	3.56	4.18	4.28	4.31	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	80	2	6	14	5	5	3.16	1385/1453	3.16	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	5	8	41	24	29	3.60	1061/1421	3.60	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	94	1	1	10	3	3	3.33	****/1365	****	3.88	4.08	4.08	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	3	21	25	59	4.21	818/1485	4.21	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	0	0	1	4	103	4.94	394/1504	4.94	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	3	15	16	34	13	7	2.78	1420/1483	3.40	4.05	4.06	4.08	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	2	9	22	33	41	3.95	1194/1425	3.99	4.47	4.41	4.43	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	9	23	27	46	4.02	1318/1426	4.15	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	18	29	27	15	18	2.87	1356/1418	3.33	4.28	4.25	4.26	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	5	28	15	27	10	19	2.77	1353/1416	3.34	4.32	4.26	4.27	3.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	14	14	13	19	15	29	3.36	980/1199	3.46	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	79	0	10	6	8	5	7	2.81	1200/1312	2.81	4.09	4.00	4.09	2.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	80	0	8	3	9	6	9	3.14	1185/1303		4.39	4.24	4.27	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	81	0	4	2	10	11	7	3.44	1126/1299	3.44	4.29	4.25	4.30	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	81	23	0	2	5	0	4	3.55	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	110	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	4.12	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	1	0	0	1		,	****	4.62	4.09	4.20	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	111	2	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.46	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.29	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	110	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	1.00	, , ,		4.50	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	111	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	111	3	0	0	0	0	1		,	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	111	3	0	0	0	0	1		,		5.00	4.17	4.25	***
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grad	les Reasons		Type		Majo	CS .
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	А б	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	в 10						

56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	С	5	General	1	Under-grad 115 Non-major 110
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	22	
				?	0			

University of Maryland Baltimore County

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)

Baltimore Count
Spring 2005

Page 154
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 27

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	12	10	4.23	914/1504	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	837/1503	4.42	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	9	11	4.12	880/1290		4.18	4.28	4.31	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	12	10	4.19	844/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	4	6	6	5	3.45	1144/1421	3.83	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	5	11	7	3.92	878/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	4	4	15	4.19	830/1485	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	5	19		1022/1504	4.76	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	13	5	4.10	798/1483	4.28	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	587/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	3	19		1073/1426	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	905/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1 7	0	1 1	3	8	13	4.32	814/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	/	3	Τ	3	5	6	3.56	901/1199	4.03	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	434/1312	4.39	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	378/1303	4.37	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	550/1299	4.30	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	12	9	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 758	***	3.90	4.01	4.00	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	96/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	1	6	13	4.36	114/ 244	4.62	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	3	3	15	4.45	136/ 227	4.68	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	106/ 225	4.77	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.48
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	2	2	5	12	4.14	99/ 207	4.61	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.14
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	***
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	1.55	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24 24	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
Was the instructor available for consultation		0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
1. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 154 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 27

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General		Under-grad	27	Non-major	21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB Baltimor

(Instr. B)

Page 155 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 27

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_		Mean	Mean
	General														
1. Did y	ou gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	12	10	4.23	914/1504	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.23
2. Did t	the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	837/1503	4.42	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.27
3. Did t	the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	9	11	4.12	880/1290	4.32	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.12
4. Did o	ther evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	12	10	4.19	844/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.19
5. Did a	assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	4	6	6	5	3.45	1144/1421	3.83	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.45
6. Did v	ritten assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	5	11	7	3.92	878/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.92
	the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	4	4	15	4.19	830/1485	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.19
	many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	5	19		1022/1504		4.90	4.69	4.65	4.62
9. How w	yould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	635/1483	4.28	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.17
	Lecture				•			1.0	4 55	400/1405	4 55	4 45	4 4 7	4 40	4 50
	the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0			4.75	420/1425		4.47	4.41	4.43	4.70
	the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	4	11		1022/1426		4.67	4.69	4.71	4.60
	ecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	848/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.22
	the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	714/1416		4.32	4.26	4.27	4.38
5. Did a	audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	8	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	636/1199	4.03	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.78
	Discussion														
1 1014	class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	434/1312	4.39	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.44
	all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	378/1303	4.39	4.39	4.24	4.09	4.73
	the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	550/1299	4.30	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.53
	special techniques successful	12	9	0	0	0	4	-		****/ 758	****	3.90	4.25	4.00	****
4. WCIC	special deciminates successivi	12		U	U	U	-	2	4.33	, 130		3.70	4.01	1.00	
	Laboratory														
1. Did t	the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	96/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.36
	you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	1	6	13	4.36	114/ 244		4.62	4.09	4.20	4.36
	necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	3	3	15	4.45	136/ 227		4.74	4.40	4.46	4.45
	the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	106/ 225		4.71	4.23	4.29	4.48
	requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	2	2	5	12	4.14	99/ 207		4.50	4.09	4.14	4.14
	Seminar														
1. Were	assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 76	***	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was t	the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 70	***	4.50	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did r	research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 67	***	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did p	presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were	criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
1 544 (	Field Work	0.4	0	0	0	-1	^	_	4 22	++++/	****	F 00	4 42	4 50	****
	ield experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 58		5.00	4.43	4.52	****
	you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
	the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 44		5.00	4.65	4.77	****
	nat degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Dia 6	conferences help you carry out field activities	24	U	0	U	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.47	* * * *
	Self Paced														
1 nid e	self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4 67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
I. DIG S	seri passa system contribute to what you reallied	۷.	J	Ü	J	J	_	۷	1.07	, 40			1.55	1.,1	

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor:

Title

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

Page 155

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 27

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General		Under-grad	27	Non-major	21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 23

Title

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 156 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student.	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Questions		NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	654/1504	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	736/1503	4.42	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	8	13	4.35	701/1290	4.32	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	11	8	4.24	798/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	7	9	4.05	718/1421	3.83	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	462/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	,	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	14		1006/1504	4.76	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	679/1483	4.28	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	366/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	690/1426	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	342/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	525/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	195/1199	4.03	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	364/1312	4.39	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20		4.37	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	897/1299	4.30	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 758	***	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	56/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0		16	4.80	29/ 244	4.62	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1		14	4.65	86/ 227	4.68	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.65
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0		19	4.95	22/ 225	4.77	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.95
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	19/ 207	4.61	4.50	4.09	4.14	
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	า									

Credits Earned Cum. (		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0 General		0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 23

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: (Instr. B)

26

Spring 2005 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 157 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncies	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	_	_	_	_	_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	654/1504			4.27	4.27	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	736/1503	4.42	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	8	13	4.35	701/1290	4.32	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	11	8	4.24	798/1453		4.08	4.21	4.23	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		1	0	2	4	7	9	4.05	718/1421	3.83	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you lear		1	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	462/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	433/1485	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	1006/1504	4.76	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiver	ess 4	0	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	679/1483	4.28	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	492/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	5	15		1073/1426	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	488/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	511/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi		8	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	403/1199		4.13	3.97	4.02	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	, -		4.09	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participat		0	0	1	1	3		4.20	,		4.39	4.24	4.27	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi		0	0	1	2	2		4.10	897/1299	4.30	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 758	***	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	56/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background informat		0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	29/ 244	4.62	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activiti		0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	86/ 227	4.68	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.65
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	22/ 225	4.77	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.95
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified		0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	19/ 207		4.50	4.09	4.14	
Seminar  2. Was the instructor available for individual attenti	on 22	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 70	****	4 E0	/ 2E	4 24	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attenti	.011 22	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ /0		4.50	4.35	4.24	
F	requency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra	ıdes			Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enougl	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 158 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 24

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quartiena				equer			_		ructor	Course			Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	737/1504	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	495/1503	4.42	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	749/1290	4.32	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	13	4.29	729/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	4	5	9	3.90	863/1421	3.83	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	7	9	3.87	928/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	577/1485	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	591/1504	4.76	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	591/1483	4.28	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	315/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1		4.95	251/1426	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5		4.57		4.52	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4		4.64	485/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	2	7	3	5	3.65	868/1199	4.03	4.13	3.97		3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	651/1312		4.09	4.00	4.09	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	2	2		4.00	910/1303	4.37	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	855/1299	4.30	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 758	***	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	50/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.65
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	47/ 244	4.62	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	44/ 227	4.68	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	60/ 225	4.77	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.76
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	44/ 207	4.61			4.14	4.71
Seminar		_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	***	5.00	4.61	4.84	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****
Freque	on as	. Diat	-rih	1+ i 01	2									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General		Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Title (Instr. B)

Instructor:

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 24

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 159 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

~	~		
Student	('011700	h'tra liiati on	Questionnaire
beauciic	COULBC	Evaluation	Quescromatic

			Frequencies		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Q1														
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.38	737/1504	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	, e	15	4.50	495/1503	4.42	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	749/1290	4.32	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	13	4.29	729/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	4	5	43	3.90	863/1421	3.83	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		0	1	3	3	7	9	3.87	928/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	577/1485	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0 1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	591/1504	4.76	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	602/1483		4.05	4.06		4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	572/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	736/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	446/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	5	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1199	4.03	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.17	651/1312	4.39	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.17
-	18	0	0	0	2	J	2	4.17	910/1303	4.39	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.00	855/1299	4.37	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	3	<i>5</i>	2		****/ 758	****	3.90	4.25	4.00	4.1/ ****
1. Were special techniques successivi	10		U	U	J	U	2	3.00	/ /30		3.90	4.01	4.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	50/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.65
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	47/ 244	4.62	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	44/ 227	4.68	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	60/ 225	4.77	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.76
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	44/ 207	4.61	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.71
Seminar	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	****		F 00	4 61	4 0 4	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23 23	0	0	0	0	0 1	U T	5.00	****/ 76 ****/ 70	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	****/ 70	^ ^ ^	4.50	4.35	4.24	^ ^ ^ ^

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	. — — — А	 11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB

Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 160 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			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	4	3	4.43	669/1504	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	258/1503	4.42	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	290/1290	4.32	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	901/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	745/1421	3.83	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	245/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	890/1485	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	4.76	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1483	4.28	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	620/1426	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	380/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	636/1199	4.03	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	364/1312	4.39	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.75	356/1303	4.37	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1299	4.30	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory	_			_		_	_							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	88/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	64/ 244	4.62	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	59/ 227	4.68	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 225	4.77	4.71	4.23	4.29	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	29/ 207	4.61	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.80

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

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101
Title CELL BIOLOGY

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 161 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KLOETZEL, JOHN (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 237

Enrollment: 237
Questionnaires: 98

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Frequencies			S		Inst	Instructor		Dept	ept UMBC Level		l Sect	
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
1 Did	aain na	Genera		m thia acumac	4	0	1	2	1 5	40	2 E	1 10	1020/1504	4 10	4 20	4 27	4 27	4 10	
				om this course	5	0	4	3 8	15 26	40	35 23		1038/1504		4.39	4.27	4.27	4.12 3.67	
		tor make clear					4	15	26 26	32 26	23		1247/1503	3.67 3.46	4.23	4.20	4.22 4.31	3.46	
				expected goals	5 3	0 72	3	15	∠6 3	⊿6 5	11		1163/1290 ****/1453	3.40 ****	4.18	4.28	4.31	3.40 ****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						2	3	9	3 21	26	30	3.87	947/1421		3.99	4.21	4.23	3.80	
						∠ 76	2	2	21	⊿6 4	30 6		****/1365	3.80 ***	3.88	4.00	4.01	3.8U ****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						4	13	15	16										
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled						1	13	T.2	10	26 4	20 89		1344/1485	3.28	4.14	4.16	4.17	3.28	
	4			bina offortions	4	1	2	3	33	44	9		329/1504	4.96		4.69	4.65	4.96	
9. HOW WO	oura you g	rade the over	all tead	thing effectiveness	6	Т	2	3	33	44	9	3.60	1197/1483	3.48	4.05	4.06	4.08	3.48	
		Lectu:	ce																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	es well	prepared	6	0	0	1	7	29	55	4.50	784/1425	4.54	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.54	
				n the subject	6	0	0	1	12	26	53	4.42	1183/1426	4.36	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.36	
				explained clearly	6	0	2	7	24	27	32	3.87	1115/1418	3.79	4.28	4.25	4.26	3.79	
		s contribute			6	1	1	5	18	33	34	4.03	1018/1416	3.96	4.32	4.26	4.27	3.96	
				our understanding	8	9	2	9	15	22	33	3.93	725/1199	4.08	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.08	
		Discu																	
				what you learned	81	0	5	2	4	1	5		****/1312	***	4.09	4.00	4.09	****	
				ed to participate	81	0	3	2	1	3	8		****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.27	****	
				nd open discussion	81	0	2	0	4	5	6		****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.30	****	
4. Were s	special te	chniques succ	essful		81	12	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****	
		Labora	atory																
1 Did th	e lah inc		_	of the material	97	0	1	0	0	0	Ο	1 00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	4.12	****	
				ground information	97	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.20	****	
				for lab activities	97	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.46	****	
	_	tructor provi			97	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.29	****	
				early specified	97	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.14	***	
	1												,						
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utic	n										
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors		
00-27	00.27								or M			0	Graduat		0	Majo	·	 59	
	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 25 28-55 9 1.00-1.99 0 B 33					ке	quil	eu I	OT M	ajui	D	U	Graduat	E	U	ма ј	) <u> </u>	33	
28-55 9 1.00-1.99 0 B 33 56-83 39 2.00-2.99 5 C 18						Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad <sup>0</sup>	8	Non-	-major	39	
56-83 39 2.00-2.99 5 C 18 84-150 14 3.00-3.49 20 D 2						GC	ııcıa	_				_	onaci -g.	Luu 3		INOII	ilia joi	3)	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 38 F 1						E.I	ecti <sup>.</sup>	Wed				1	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enona	h	
Grau.	O	3.30 4.00	50	P 0		11.11	CCCI	v CB				_	respons				re not enough		
P 0							,				0	2	respons	בט נט ג	e sign	ııııdı	ıL		

Other

83

I

0

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101 Title

CELL BIOLOGY (Instr. B) Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 162 JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 237 Questionnaires: 98

Instructor:

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General			_	_										
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	3	15	40	35		1038/1504			4.27	4.27	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	4	8	26	32	23		1247/1503	3.67	4.23	4.20	4.22	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	5	15	26	26	21		1163/1290	3.46	4.18	4.28	4.31	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	72	3	1	3	5	11		****/1453	***	4.08	4.21	4.23	***
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	2	3	9	21	26	30	3.80		3.80	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	76	2	2	2	4	6		****/1365	****	3.88	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	4	13	15	16	26	20	3.28	1344/1485	3.28	4.14	4.16	4.17	3.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	4	89		329/1504	4.96	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	2	8	38	26	7	3.35	1298/1483	3.48	4.05	4.06	4.08	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	Ο	1	6	15	51	4.59	688/1425	4.54	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	3	11	20	39		1248/1426	4.36	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	3	8	19	20	23		1181/1418	3.79	4.28	4.25	4.71	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	1	1	5	19	23	24		1108/1416	3.79	4.32	4.26	4.27	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	<u> </u>	1	4	8	18		4.23		4.08	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.08
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	O	1	4	0	10	34	4.23	511/1199	4.00	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	81	0	5	2	4	1	5	2.94	****/1312	****	4.09	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	81	0	3	2	1	3	8	3.65	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	81	0	2	0	4	5	6	3.76	****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	81	12	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory	0.7	•	_	•	•	•	•	1 00			4 50	4 00	4 10	
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	97	0	Τ	0	0	0	0		****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	97	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 244		4.62	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	97	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	97	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	97	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.14	****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	25	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	59
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	В	33						
56-83	39	2.00-2.99	5	C	18	General	1	Under-grad	98	Non-major	39
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	20	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	38	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	83	_			
				?	8						

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 0101
Title CELL BIOLOGY LAB

Title CELL BIOLOGY L
Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN

Enrollment: 208
Questionnaires: 160

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 163 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncie	s		Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	32	0	1	2	11	44	70	4.41	700/1504	4.41	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	33	0	0	2	4	33	88	4.63	357/1503	4.63	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	34	0	2	5	13	39	67	4.30	741/1290	4.30	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	34	5	2	4	16	29	70	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	38	16	4	3	17	27	55	4.19	605/1421	4.19	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	40	1	3	8	27	30	51	3.99	794/1365	3.99	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.99
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	39	0	0	1	7	39	74	4.54	423/1485	4.54	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	40	2	0	0	0	11	107	4.91	657/1504	4.91	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	3	2	2	14	72	63	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	71	0	0	0	2	6	81	4.89	209/1425	4.89	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	72	0	0	0	4	16	68	4.73	878/1426	4.73	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	72	0	0	0	1	15	72	4.81	191/1418	4.81	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	72	1	1	1	2	15	68	4.70	394/1416	4.70	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	78	28	2	2	11	18	21	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
	105	0	0	0	2	_	27	1 (0	++++/1210	++++	4 00	4 00	4 00	++++
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	125	0	0	0	3	5	27		****/1312	****	4.09	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	127	0	0	1	6	9	17		****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	128	0	1 1	1 2	6	6	18		,	****	4.29	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	129	10	Τ	2	3	8	7	3.86	****/ 758	***	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	77	0	1	1	7	19	55	4.52	69/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.52
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	0	1	1	17	64	4.73	41/ 244	4.73	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	80	0	1	1	2	20	56	4.61	98/ 227		4.74	4.40	4.46	4.61
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	78	0	0	0	7	13	62	4.67	80/ 225		4.71	4.23	4.29	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	78	1	0	5	8	18	50	4.40	70/ 207		4.50	4.09		4.40
or more requirements for two reports creating specifical	, 0	_	ŭ	J	Ū		50		. 5, 25.	1.10	1.50	1.05		
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	158	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	158	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	158	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	158	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
m' 11 m 1														
Field Work	1 5 0	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 「つ	***	E 00	4 42	4 50	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	159	0		0		0	1		****/ 58		5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	159	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	159	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
The fact of the fa		ŭ	-	Ū	ŭ	ŭ	_		, 10					

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	***

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 0101
Title CELL BIOLOGY LAB

Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN

Enrollment: 208
Questionnaires: 160

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 163 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	64	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	82
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	В	42						
56-83	44	2.00-2.99	19	С	10	General	0	Under-grad	159	Non-major	78
84-150	34	3.00-3.49	31	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	37	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Mean	s there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses t	o be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	122				
				?	5						

Title COMP. ANIMAL PHYSIOLOG

Instructor: VIANCOUR, TERRY

Enrollment: 173
Questionnaires: 95

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 164 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ceneral   Cene	Questions	NR	NA	Fr	eque 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 5 0 0 0 1 5 2 9 55 4.53 509/1504 4.53 4.39 4.27 4.27 4.53 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 5 0 3 2 17 30 38 4.09 1002/1503 4.09 4.23 4.20 4.22 4.09 4.31 3.96 4.18 4.28 4.29 4.00 4.01 3.44 4.16 4.17 4.10 4.16 4.17 4.10 4.16 4.17 4.18 4.18 4.18 4.18 4.18 4.18 4.18 4.18															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 5 0 3 2 17 30 38 4.09 1002/1503 4.09 4.23 4.20 4.09 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 0 8 24 22 36 3.96 979/120 3.96 4.18 4.28 4.31 3.96 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 70 1 0 1 5 13 4.65 ***** 4.08 4.21 4.23 **** 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 1 7 11 28 20 22 3.44 1150/1421 3.44 3.99 4.00 4.01 3.44 5. Did assignments contribute to what you learned 6 76 0 2 3 1 7 4.00 ****/1365 **** 3.88 4.08 4.08 **** 4.08 4.08 **** 4.08 4.08 4.08 4.08 4.08 4.08 4.08 4.08		_	0	0	1	_	20	55	/ E2	E00/1E04	/ E2	1 20	1 27	1 27	/ E2
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5 0 0 0 8 24 22 36 3.96 979/1290 3.96 4.18 4.28 4.31 3.96 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 70 1 0 1 5 13 4.45 ****/1453 **** 4.08 4.21 4.23 **** 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 1 7 1 1 28 20 22 3.44 1150/1421 3.44 3.99 4.00 4.01 3.44 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 8 18 19 43 41 9.00 ****/1365 **** 3.88 4.08 4.08 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8 0 0 0 0 8 1 0 0 8 7 5.00 1/1504 5.00 4.90 4.69 4.65 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 1 1 0 15 36 26 4.10 793/1483 4.10 4.05 4.06 4.08 4.10 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.06 4.0		_	0	2	T	1 7				,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5 70 1 0 1 5 13 4.45 ****/1453 **** 4.08 4.21 4.23 **** 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 1 7 11 28 20 22 3.4 1150/1421 3.44 3.99 4.00 4.01 3.44 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 76 0 2 3 1 7 4.00 ****/1365 **** 3.88 4.08 4.08 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 7 0 0 8 18 19 43 4.10 938/1485 4.10 4.14 4.16 4.17 4.10 8. How many times was class cancelled 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 87 5.00 1/1504 5.00 4.90 4.69 4.65 5.00  Recture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 13 0 0 0 5 9 68 4.77 402/1425 4.77 4.47 4.41 4.43 4.77 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 16 0 0 1 4 9 65 4.75 843/1426 4.75 4.67 4.69 4.71 4.75 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 4 10 26 39 4.27 843/1426 4.75 4.67 4.69 4.71 4.75 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 22 1 0 1 7 9 55 4.64 195/1199 4.64 4.13 3.97 4.02 4.64  Discussion  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 79 0 0 0 2 4 4 6 3.88 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.09 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 77 0 0 0 0 3 4 11 4.44 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.27 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 79 0 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.27 **** 4. Were special techniques understanding of the material 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/223 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/223 **** 4.54 4.09 4.00 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 *****	1 3		-	0	Ω										
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 1 7 11 28 20 22 3.44 1150/1421 3.44 3.99 4.00 4.01 3.44 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 76 0 2 3 1 7 4.00 *****1365 **** 3.88 4.08 4.08 **** 4.59 4.09 4.01 8. How many times was class cancelled 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 87 5.00 1/1504 5.00 4.14 4.16 4.17 4.10 8. How many times was class cancelled 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 87 5.00 1/1504 5.00 4.90 4.69 4.65 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 1 1 0 15 36 26 4.10 793/1483 4.10 4.05 4.06 4.08 4.10 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00		5		•	_										
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 2 3 1 7 4.00 ****/1365 **** 3.88 4.08 4.08 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 7 0 0 8 18 19 43 4.10 938/1485 4.10 4.14 4.16 4.17 4.10 8. How many times was class cancelled 8 0 0 0 0 0 87 5.00 1/1504 5.00 4.90 4.69 4.65 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 1 1 0 15 36 26 4.10 793/1483 4.10 4.05 4.06 4.08 4.10  Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 13 0 0 0 5 9 68 4.77 402/1425 4.77 4.47 4.41 4.43 4.77 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 16 0 0 1 4 9 65 4.75 843/1426 4.75 4.67 4.69 4.71 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 16 0 0 4 10 26 39 4.27 838/1418 4.27 4.28 4.25 4.26 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 1 6 15 56 4.57 564/1416 4.57 4.32 4.26 4.27 4.57 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 22 1 0 1 7 9 55 4.64 195/1199 4.64 4.13 3.97 4.02 4.64  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 79 0 0 2 4 4 6 3.88 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.09 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 77 0 0 0 0 3 4 11 4.44 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.27 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 79 0 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.27 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 79 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/233 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 79 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/233 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		6		7	•	_	_			,					
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 7 0 0 8 18 19 43 4.10 938/1485 4.10 4.14 4.16 4.17 4.10 8. How many times was class cancelled 8 0 0 0 0 0 87 5.00 1/1504 5.00 4.90 4.69 4.65 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 16 1 1 0 15 36 26 4.10 793/1483 4.10 4.05 4.06 4.08 4.10 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	-	-	_	ń				7							
8. How many times was class cancelled		-		•	_	_	_	43		,					
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 13 0 0 0 5 9 68 4.77 402/1425 4.77 4.47 4.41 4.43 4.77 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 16 0 0 1 4 9 65 4.75 843/1426 4.75 4.67 4.69 4.71 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 7. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 7. Were you provided with adequate background information 7. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 7. Did the lab instructor provide assistance provide assistance provided provided assistance provided assistance provided assistance provided p	3 3 1 1		-	-	-					,					
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject  1. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  1. Did class discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4. Were special techniques successful  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  9. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	±		-	1	-										
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 13 0 0 0 5 9 68 4.77 402/1425 4.77 4.47 4.41 4.43 4.77 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 16 0 0 1 4 9 65 4.75 843/1426 4.75 4.67 4.69 4.71 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 16 0 0 4 10 26 39 4.27 838/1418 4.27 4.28 4.25 4.26 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 1 6 15 56 4.57 564/1416 4.57 4.32 4.26 4.27 4.28 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 22 1 0 1 7 9 55 4.64 195/1199 4.64 4.13 3.97 4.02 4.64  Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 79 0 0 2 4 4 6 3.88 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.09 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 77 0 0 0 3 4 11 4.44 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.27 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 79 0 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 ****/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.30 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 79 8 1 1 3 1 2 3.25 ****/ 758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.00 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 **** 4. The following interest with the subject 1. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****	7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		_	_	Ū		50	20	1.10	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	1.10	1.05	1.00	1.00	1.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 16 0 0 1 4 9 65 4.75 843/1426 4.75 4.67 4.69 4.71 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 16 0 0 4 10 26 39 4.27 838/1418 4.27 4.28 4.25 4.26 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 1 6 15 56 4.57 564/1416 4.57 4.32 4.26 4.27 4.57 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 22 1 0 1 7 9 55 4.64 195/1199 4.64 4.13 3.97 4.02 4.64    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 79 0 0 2 4 4 6 3.88 ***/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.09 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 77 0 0 0 3 4 11 4.44 ***/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.27 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 79 0 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 ***/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.30 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 79 8 1 1 3 1 2 3.25 ****/ 758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.00 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 **** 3. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 4.20 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****	Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 16 0 0 1 4 9 65 4.75 843/1426 4.75 4.67 4.69 4.71 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 16 0 0 4 10 26 39 4.27 838/1418 4.27 4.28 4.25 4.26 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 1 6 15 56 4.57 564/1416 4.57 4.32 4.26 4.27 4.57 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 22 1 0 1 7 9 55 4.64 195/1199 4.64 4.13 3.97 4.02 4.64    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 79 0 0 2 4 4 6 3.88 ***/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.09 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 77 0 0 0 3 4 11 4.44 ***/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.27 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 79 0 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 ***/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.30 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 79 8 1 1 3 1 2 3.25 ****/ 758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.00 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 **** 3. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 4.20 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	5	9	68	4.77	402/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 16 0 0 4 10 26 39 4.27 838/1418 4.27 4.28 4.25 4.26 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 1 6 15 56 4.57 564/1416 4.57 4.32 4.26 4.27 4.57 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 22 1 0 1 7 9 55 4.64 195/1199 4.64 4.13 3.97 4.02 4.64    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 79 0 0 2 4 4 6 3.88 ***/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.09 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 77 0 0 0 3 4 11 4.44 ***/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.27 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 79 0 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 ***/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.30 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 79 8 1 1 3 1 2 3.25 ****/ 758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.00 ****    Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 ****   2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 4.20 ****   3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 247 *** 4.74 4.40 4.46 ****   4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****		16	0	0	1	4	9	65	4.75	843/1426	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 1 6 15 56 4.57 564/1416 4.57 4.32 4.26 4.27 4.57 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 22 1 0 1 7 9 55 4.64 195/1199 4.64 4.13 3.97 4.02 4.64    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 79 0 0 2 4 4 6 3.88 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.09 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 77 0 0 0 3 4 11 4.44 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.27 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 79 0 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 ****/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.30 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 79 8 1 1 3 1 2 3.25 ****/ 758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.00 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 4.20 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****	<u> </u>	16	0	0	4	10	26	39	4.27	838/1418	4.27	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.27
Discussion  Discus	<u> </u>	16	0	1	1	6	15	56	4.57	564/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.57
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 79 0 0 0 2 4 4 6 3.88 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.09 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 77 0 0 0 0 3 4 11 4.44 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.27 ****  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 79 0 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 ****/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.30 ****  4. Were special techniques successful 79 8 1 1 3 1 2 3.25 ****/ 758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.00 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 4.20 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****	<u>-</u>	22	1	0	1	7	9	55	4.64	195/1199	4.64	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.64
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 79 0 0 2 4 4 6 3.88 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.09 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 77 0 0 0 0 3 4 11 4.44 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.27 ****  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 79 0 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 ****/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.30 ****  4. Were special techniques successful 79 8 1 1 3 1 2 3.25 ****/ 758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.00 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 4.20 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ***/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ***/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 77 0 0 0 3 4 11 4.44 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.27 ****  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 79 0 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 ****/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.30 ****  4. Were special techniques successful 79 8 1 1 3 1 2 3.25 ****/ 758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.00 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 4.20 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 79 0 0 0 2 5 9 4.44 ****/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.30 ****  4. Were special techniques successful 79 8 1 1 3 1 2 3.25 ****/ 758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.00 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 4.20 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	79	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	****/1312	***	4.09	4.00	4.09	***
4. Were special techniques successful 79 8 1 1 3 1 2 3.25 ****/ 758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.00 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 4.20 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	77	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	****/1303	***	4.39	4.24	4.27	****
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 4.20 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	79	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	****/1299	***	4.29	4.25	4.30	***
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 4.20 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****	4. Were special techniques successful	79	8	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 4.12 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 4.20 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 4.62 4.09 4.20 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 ****  4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****	Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 94 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.46 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****	1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	94	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	4.12	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 93 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 4.71 4.23 4.29 ****	2. Were you provided with adequate background information	94	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.20	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 95 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 / 225 4.71 4.25 4.29	3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	94	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.74		4.46	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 94 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 207 **** 4.50 4.09 4.14 ****	<u>-</u>		0	0	0	0	1	1		, -	****				
	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	94	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.14	****

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	 А	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	69
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	31						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	8	C	24	General	0	Under-grad	95	Non-major	26
84-150	30	3.00-3.49	16	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	74				
				Ş	2						

Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA

Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 12

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 165 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

#### 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	3	3	5	4.18	972/1504	4.48	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	827/1503	4.61	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	681/1290	4.73	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	855/1453	4.51	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	745/1421	4.09	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	731/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	842/1485	4.53	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	989/1483	4.26	4.05	4.06	4.08	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	618/1425	4.74	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	878/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	526/1418	4.64	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	688/1416	4.61	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	845/1199	4.28	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1312	4.42	4.09	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1303		4.39	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/1299		4.29	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	***	3.90	4.01	4.00	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.14	132/ 233	4.58	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	102/ 244	4.69	4.62	4.09	4.12	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	108/ 227	4.74	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.43
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	148/ 225	4.71	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	53/ 207	4.73	4.50	4.09		4.57

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				2	0						

Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA

Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 18

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 166 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

#### 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	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	927/1504	4.48	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	248/1503	4.61	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	180/1290	4.73	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	9	8	4.33	680/1453	4.51	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	705/1421	4.09	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	4	7	4	3.50	1153/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	716/1485	4.53	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	9	4	3.88	1009/1483	4.26	4.05	4.06	4.08	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	712/1425	4.74	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	940/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	736/1418	4.64	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	623/1416	4.61	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	776/1199	4.28	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1312	4.42	4.09	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1299	4.44	4.29	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	131/ 233	4.58	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	125/ 244	4.69	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	163/ 227	4.74	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	90/ 225	4.71	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.62
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	57/ 207	4.73	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.54

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				2	0						

Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA

Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 167 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	737/1504	4.48	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	357/1503	4.61	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	389/1290	4.73	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	775/1453	4.51	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	887/1421	4.09	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	690/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	455/1485	4.53	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	850/1483	4.26	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	420/1425	4.74	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	825/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	261/1418	4.64	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	498/1416	4.61	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	495/1199	4.28	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1312	4.42	4.09	4.00	4.09	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.27	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1299		4.29	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	***	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	Λ	_	5.00	1/ 233	4.58	4.59	4.09	4.12	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 244	4.69	4.62	4.09	4.12	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 244	4.74	4.74	4.40	4.46	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 225	4.74	4.74	4.23	4.40	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 207	4.71	4.71	4.23	4.14	5.00
J. Mere requirements for tab reports creatry specified	U	U	U	U	U	U	J	5.00	1/20/	7.73	1.50	±.∪⊅	1.11	3.00

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

COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA

Title

Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 168 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Fre	anier	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	549/1504	4.48	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.50
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	403/1503	4.61	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.58
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	344/1290	4.73	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.67
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	352/1453	4.51	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.58
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	692/1421	4.09	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.08
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	297/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.50
	Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	370/1485	4.53	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.58
	How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	778/1504	4.97	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.83
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	167/1483	4.26	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.73
	Lecture														
1	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	285/1425	4.74	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.83
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	967/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.67
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	378/1418	4.64	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.67
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	446/1416		4.32	4.26	4.27	4.67
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	320/1199		4.13	3.97		4.45
٥.	Did addiovisual recimitates cimalice your diderstanding				O	O	2	O	1.15	320/1100	4.20	4.13	3.77	4.02	1.13
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	465/1312	4.42	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.40
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	910/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.00
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	922/1299	4.44	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.00
4.	Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
	- 1														
-	Laboratory	2	0	_	0	-1	_	_	4 60	F.C. / 022	4 50	4 50	4 00	4 10	4 60
	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	56/ 233	4.58	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.60
	Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	48/ 244	4.69	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.70
	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0 0	0	0	0	3	7		73/ 227		4.74	4.40	4.46	4.70
	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0		0	1	2	7	4.60	92/ 225		4.71	4.23	4.29	4.60
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	U	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 207	4.73	4.50	4.09	4.14	5.00
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****
3.	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4.	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	***	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
	Field Work														
1	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.47	****
٥.	224 Compared Merp 104 Carry Out Freigh decryffiles	- 4	J	5	5	5	5	_	3.00	, 57		1.50		1.1/	
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	***	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	***

Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA

Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 168 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA

Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 16

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 169 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	-1	0	0	0	0	_	1.0	4 05	161/1504	4 40	4 20	4 00	4 05	4 05
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	161/1504		4.39	4.27	4.27	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	238/1503	4.61	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	159/1290	4.73	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	Ţ	0	•	0	1		13	4.80	158/1453	4.51	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	Τ	0	0	3	3	/	4.31	509/1421	4.09	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	245/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	240/1485	4.53	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	108/1483	4.26	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	125/1425	4.74	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	191/1418	4.64	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	255/1416	4.61	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	88/1199	4.28	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	221/1312	4.42	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	4.44	4.29	4.25	4.27	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	0	0	7		****/ 758	****	3.90	4.25	4.00	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	/ /56		3.90	4.01	4.00	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	33/ 233	4.58	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	32/ 244	4.69	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.79
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	50/ 227	4.74	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	29/ 225	4.71	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	42/ 207	4.73	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.71

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				2	0						

Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA

Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 14

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 170 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	262/1504	4.48	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	248/1503	4.61	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1290	4.73	4.18	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	101/1453	4.51	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	596/1421	4.09	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	3	0	6	4.00	782/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	98/1485	4.53	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	710/1483	4.26	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	525/1425	4.74	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	342/1418	4.64	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	525/1416	4.61	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	242/1199	4.28	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	663/1312	4.42	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	737/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	741/1299	4.44	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 758	***	3.90	4.01	4.00	***
T all acceptances														
Laboratory	_	0	^	^	0	_	7	4 70	24/ 222	4 50	4 50	4 00	4 10	4 70
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	∠ 1	8	4.78	34/ 233 21/ 244	4.58	4.59 4.62	4.09 4.09	4.12	4.78 4.89
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5 5	0	0	0	0	0	9	4.89	1/ 227	4.69 4.74	4.02	4.09	4.20 4.46	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5 5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 227	4.74	4.74	4.40	4.46	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5 5	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.56	55/ 207		4.71	4.23		4.56
J. Were requirements for rap reports creatry specified	5	U	J	U	4	U	,	Ŧ.50	33/ 201	<b>I.</b> /3	<b>4.</b> 50	4.03	4.14	T.30

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	10
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 397 0101

Title ETHICS/INTEG SCIENT RE

Instructor: KLOETZEL, JOHN

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 171
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1					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	2	1	5	8	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	9	5	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	866/1290	4.14	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1307/1453	3.45	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	2	2	8	3.53	1101/1421	3.53	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1201/1365	3.40	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1128/1485	3.83	4.14	4.16	4.17	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	624/1483	4.27	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	603/1425	4.64	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	317/1418	4.71	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	961/1416	4.14	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	561/1199	4.17	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	268/1303	4.83	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	273/ 758		3.90	4.01		4.33
Cominan														
Seminar	1 7	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	****/ 76	****	г оо	1 (1	4 0 4	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17 17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76 ****/ 76		5.00 5.00	4.61 4.44	4.84 4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17 17	0	0	0	1	0	Τ		****/ 73	****	5.00	4.44	4.25	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	Ι/	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ /3		5.00	4.⊥/	4.∠3	.,

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	15			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				2	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 397W 0101
Title SCIENTIFIC WRITE

SCIENTIFIC WRITING PORTER, JANE P.

Instructor: PORTER, J
Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 172 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	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 new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.23	4.20	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.08	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	548/1421	4.25	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	493/1365	4.33	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.14	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1483	4.75	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.28	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.32	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.09	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	3.90	4.01	4.00	4.50

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

Course-Section: BIOL 414 0101

EUKARYOTICS GEN/MOL BI

FARABAUGH, PHIL Instructor:

Title

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 25

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 173 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Scaaciic	COULSE	ii vai ua ciioii	Ouestionnaire

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	5	13	4 12	1029/1504	4.12	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	11	5		1221/1503	3.72	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	7	10		971/1290	3.96	4.18	4.28	4.32	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	7	11		1001/1453	4.00	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	8	3	4	10	3.64	1030/1421	3.64	3.99	4.00	4.02	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	7	6	10	3.96	830/1365	3.96	3.88	4.08	4.09	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	5	11	5	3.75	1176/1485	3.75	4.14	4.16	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.90	4.69	4.73	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	4	3	9	5	3.71	1147/1483	3.71	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	6	3	12	3.88	1227/1425	3.88	4.47	4.41	4.38	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	8	13		1237/1426	4.32	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	5	5	9	6		1209/1418	3.64	4.28	4.25	4.25	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	9	8	3.80	1145/1416	3.80	4.32	4.26	4.26	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	3	7	3	10	3.75	820/1199	3.75	4.13	3.97	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	5	6	2	3.73	912/1312	3.73	4.09	4.00	4.07	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	1	3	8	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	3	5	5		1012/1299	3.87	4.29	4.25	4.38	3.87
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	553/ 758	3.62	3.90	4.01		3.62
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 67	***	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76	***	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	***	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	***	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	***	***

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	9	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 20 3

I ? Course-Section: BIOL 428 0101

COMPUTER APPL MOLEC BI

Title Instructor: ONEILL, MICHAEL

Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 174 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	6	4	4.09	1052/1504	4.09	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1221/1503	3.73	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.18	4.28	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1104/1453	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.22	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	4			1017/1421	3.67	3.99	4.00	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.88	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	830/1485	4.20	4.14	4.16	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	1009/1483	3.89	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	2	5	1		1337/1425	3.30	4.47		4.38	3.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	7		1128/1426	4.50	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	1	5			1314/1418	3.20	4.28	4.25	4.25	3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1 1	0 7	2 1	1 0	1 0	4 2	2		1287/1416	3.30	4.32	4.26	4.26	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	/	Т	U	U	۷	U	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	4.13	3.97	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	4.09	4.00	4.07	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	3	0	3	2	3.50	1121/1303	3.50	4.39	4.24	4.34	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	2	1	2	3		1053/1299	3.75	4.29	4.25	4.38	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	102/ 233	4.33	4.59	4.09	3.78	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	224/ 244	3.00	4.62	4.09	3.56	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	153/ 225	4.00	4.71	4.23	3.81	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0 1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 76	***	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	Т	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.12	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 40	***	****	4.53	5.00	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
-														

Course-Section: BIOL 428 0101

Title COMPUTER APPL MOLEC BI

Instructor: ONEILL,

ONEILL, MICHAEL

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 174 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	1	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	10	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 434 0101

MICROBIAL MOLEC GENETI

Title WOLF, RICHARD E Instructor:

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 21

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 175 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	4	17	4.81	206/1504	4.81	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	258/1503	4.71	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	290/1290	4.71	4.18	4.28	4.32	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	924/1453	4.13	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	158/1421	4.75	3.99	4.00	4.02	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	0	0	3	7	4.08	737/1365	4.08	3.88	4.08	4.09	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	240/1485	4.71	4.14	4.16	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	112/1483	4.82	4.05	4.06	4.11	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	179/1425	4.90	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	620/1426	4.86	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	552/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	380/1416	4.71	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	548/1199	4.19	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	269/1312	4.64	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	981/1299	3.93	4.29	4.25	4.38	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 758	***	3.90	4.01	4.17	***

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	11	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	10	Non-major	11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there a	are not enougl	h
				P	1			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 443 0101

ADV TOPICS: DEVEL BIOLO

BLUMBERG, DAPHN (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 176
JUN 14, 2005
Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 18

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	239/1504	4.78	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	13	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2		****/1290	****	4.18	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	618/1453	4.39	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	151/1421	4.76	3.99	4.00	4.02	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	407/1365	4.41	3.88	4.08	4.09	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	536/1485	4.44	4.14	4.16	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	493/1483	4.39	4.05	4.06	4.11	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	401/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	736/1418	4.35	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	2	4		1145/1416	3.90	4.32	4.26	4.26	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	271/1199		4.13	3.97	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	142/1312	4.85	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	157/1303	4.92	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	263/1299	4.85	4.29	4.25	4.38	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	255/ 758	4.38	3.90	4.01	4.17	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>s</b>
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 8		Re	 quir	ed f	 or M	 ajor	 `s	0	 Graduat	 e	3	Majo	 or	7

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

Course-Section: BIOL 443 0101

ADV TOPICS: DEVEL BIOLO

(Instr. B)

Enrollment: 2.1 Ouestionnaires: 18

Title

Instructor:

# Spring 2005 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 177

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Rank General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 15 4.78 239/1504 4.78 4.39 4.27 4.33 4.78 0 0 0 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Ω 3 13 4.50 495/1503 4.50 4.23 4.20 4.18 4.50 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 15 0 2 4.67 \*\*\*\*/1290 \*\*\*\* 4.18 4.28 4.32 \*\*\*\* 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Ω Ω 6 10 4.39 618/1453 4.39 4.08 4.21 4.22 4.39 Ω 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 2 14 4.76 151/1421 4.76 3.99 4.00 4.02 4.76 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 5 10 4.41 407/1365 4.41 3.88 4.08 4.09 4.41 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 1 1 5 11 4.44 536/1485 4.44 4.14 4.16 4.14 4.44 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 18 5.00 1/1504 5.00 4.90 4.69 4.73 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 4 4.40 457/1483 4.39 4.05 4.06 4.11 4.39 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 14 0 0 0 0 4 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/1425 4.00 4.47 4.41 4.38 4.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 0 3 7 4.70 926/1426 4.81 4.67 4.69 4.72 4.81 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 12 Ω 4 2 4.33 772/1418 4.35 4.28 4.25 4.25 4.35 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 3 1 3 4.00 1029/1416 3.90 4.32 4.26 4.26 3.90 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 271/1199 4.50 4.13 3.97 4.05 4.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 Ω 0 2 11 4.85 142/1312 4.85 4.09 4.00 4.07 4.85 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 1 12 4.92 157/1303 4.92 4.39 4.24 4.34 4.92 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 12 4.85 263/1299 4.85 4.29 4.25 4.38 4.85 5 4. Were special techniques successful 3 4 4.38 255/758 4.38 3.90 4.01 4.17 4.38 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 15 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 76 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.61 4.63 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 70 \*\*\*\* 4.50 4.35 4.63 67 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 3 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 5.00 4.34 4.34 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 76 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.44 4.51 0 2 1 0 3.33 \*\*\*\*/ 73 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.17 4.29 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 15 Ω Frequency Distribution Expected Grades Credits Earned Cum. GPA Reasons 00 - 270.00 - 0.998 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 3 Major Α 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 3 1 В 2 56-83 2.00-2.99 1 C General 5 Under-grad 15 Non-major 11 0 84-150 6 3.00 - 3.495 D 0 Grad. 3.50-4.00 Electives #### - Means there are not enough

Other

Р

I

Course-Section: BIOL 454 0101
Title VISION SCIENCE

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 178 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYLL (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 13

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 13

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
a 1														
General	0	0	0	^	0	_	_	4 00	014/1504	4 00	4 20	4 07	4 22	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	כ	4.23	914/1504		4.39	4.27	4.33	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	3		1008/1503		4.23	4.20	4.18	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2 1	7 5			1098/1290	3.69 4.00	4.18 4.08	4.28	4.32	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	3	2		1001/1453 1168/1421	3.42	3.99	4.21	4.22	4.00 3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn		0	0	1	0	3 7	.5 ⊿	4.17	672/1365		3.88	4.00	4.02	3.42 4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	-	4.08	953/1485		4.14	4.16	4.14	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504		4.14	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene		0	0	0	5	5	1		1183/1483		4.05	4.06	4.11	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	55 2	U	U	U	J	J	_	3.01	1103/1403	3.77	1.05	4.00	4.11	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1050/1425	4.50	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1104/1426	4.69	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1189/1418	3.85	4.28	4.25	4.25	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1004/1416	4.27	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin	g 0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	636/1199	4.21	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	. 8	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	507/1303	4.60	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussio		0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.29	4.25	4.38	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 76		5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attentio		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 70		4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 67		5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 76		5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	***
Fr	equency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	es			Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	 Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	2	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				Ş	2						

Baltimore County Spring 2005

Course-Section: BIOL 454 0101 University of Maryland Page 179 Title VISION SCIENCE JUN 14, 2005 (Instr. B) Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	914/1504	4.23	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.23
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1008/1503	4.08	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.08
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	2	3.69	1098/1290	3.69	4.18	4.28	4.32	3.69
		uations reflect			0	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.00
				what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	3	3		1168/1421	3.42	3.99	4.00	4.02	3.42
				to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	4	4.17	672/1365	4.17	3.88	4.08	4.09	4.17
		g system clearl		ained	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	,		4.14	4.16	4.14	4.08
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504		4.90	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	989/1483	3.77	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.77
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	402/1425	4.50	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.50
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	643/1426	4.69	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.69
		explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1013/1418	3.85	4.28	4.25	4.25	3.85		
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46				4.26	4.26	4.27
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	359/1199	4.21	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.21
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	507/1303	4.60	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.60
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.29	4.25	4.38	4.60
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		8	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****
		Semina	ır															
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	***
2. Was the	e instruc	ctor available	for ind	dividual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	***
3. Did re	search pr	rojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	***
4. Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute	to what	you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	***
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading mad	le clear	:	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Po	asons				ጥናን	ре			Majors	
									, . – – –								, . – – – –	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 2		Re	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	7
28-55 56-83	0 1	B 7 C 2		Ge:	nera:	1				1	Under-q	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	6		
84-150	9	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	D 0											-		5	-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ectiv	ves				0	#### -					ıh
				P 0 I 0		O+.	her					9	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				т о		Ut.	ner.					9						

Course-Section: BIOL 456 0101

PLANT MOLECULAR BIOLOG

Instructor: BUSTOS, MAURICI

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 13

Title

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 180 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	509/1504	4.54	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	795/1503	4.31	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1290	****	4.18	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	501/1453	4.46	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	320/1421	4.50	3.99	4.00	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	742/1365	4.08	3.88	4.08	4.09	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	3	3	1	4	3.55	1268/1485	3.55	4.14	4.16	4.14	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1345/1504		4.90	4.69	4.73	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	804/1483	4.08	4.05	4.06	4.11	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	1100/1425	4.15	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	451/1426	4.92	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	848/1418	4.25	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	479/1199	4.27	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	4.83	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.38	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.90	4.01	4.17	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there a	are not enougl	n
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 468 0101

ECOL RIVERS AND STREAM

Instructor: WEBER, CARL S

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 19

Title

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 181 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	_	12	4.71	318/1504	4.71	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.71
	2	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	805/1503	4.29	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	Τ	0	Τ	0	9 11	4.29	488/1290	4.29	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0		3	11	4.53	963/1453	4.53	4.18	4.28	4.32	4.53
<u> </u>	2	0	1	0	2	3 6	•	3.82	903/1453	3.82	3.99	4.21	4.22	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	∠ 1	2	5	6	3.82	954/1365	3.82	3.88	4.00	4.02	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	_	0	∠ 1	U T	2	5	7	4.12	926/1485		4.14			
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	-	Ţ	0	3	5	8		,	4.12		4.16	4.14	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	۷	0	0	·	0	Τ	16	4.94	394/1504	4.94	4.90	4.69	4.73	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	U	0	Τ	6	8	4.47	385/1483	4.47	4.05	4.06	4.11	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	209/1425	4.88	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	331/1418	4.71	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	232/1416	4.82	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	4		4.73	139/1199	4.73	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.73
5. Did dadiovibadi teelmiqueb elmanee jour anderbeanding	_	-	Ü	J	J	-		1.75	133/1133	1.75	1.13	3.77	1.05	1.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	902/1312	3.75	4.09	4.00	4.07	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	863/1303	4.14	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	798/1299	4.25	4.29	4.25	4.38	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****
-														
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	***	****	4.60	4.83	****

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 476 0101 University of Maryland ANTIBOTICS Instructor: LOVETT, PAUL S

Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 182

JUN 14, 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 21

Title

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	2	18	4.90	131/1504	4.90	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	380/1503	4.60	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.18	4.28	4.32	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	2	15	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	14	4.40	410/1421	4.40	3.99	4.00	4.02	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	462/1365	4.37	3.88	4.08	4.09	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	2	1	15	4.35	648/1485	4.35	4.14	4.16	4.14	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	8	5	3.95	933/1483	3.95	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	724/1425	4.55	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	6	10	4.20	905/1418	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	16	4.55	574/1416	4.55	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	1	1	1	0	7	4.10	600/1199	4.10	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	493/1312	4.38	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.29	4.25	4.38	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	***	3.90	4.01	4.17	***

Credits E	Credits Earned			Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	С	1	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0	FIECCIVES		responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101

SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS

LINDAHL, LASSE (Instr. A)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 183 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quantifer a				-	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	3	2	2		1386/1503	3.22	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1171/1290	3.43	4.18	4.28	4.32	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.08	4.21	4.22	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	0	2	1	2.57	1386/1421	2.57	3.99	4.00	4.02	2.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1249/1365	3.25	3.88	4.08	4.09	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1284/1485	3.50	4.14	4.16	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.90	4.69	4.73	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1302/1483	3.71	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.71
Lecture	_	•	•	_	•		_		1055/1405	4 01	4 45	4 4 7	4 20	4 01
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	0	4	2		1257/1425	4.01	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	5		1128/1426	4.66	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	4	2		1163/1418	4.22	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	0			1167/1416	3.97		4.26	4.26	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	574/1199	4.37	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1312	****	4.09	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	***	4.29	4.25	4.38	***
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	***	4.50	4.09	3.69	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	0		****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	***
	-	_	_	-	-	-	-		, , , , ,					
_		- D-1 4			_									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 10 2

I

?

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101

SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland Page 184 Baltimore County JUN 14, 2005 Spring 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	-	ncies 3	3 4	5		ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
**************************************		NA 												
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1386/1503	3.22	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1171/1290	3.43	4.18	4.28	4.32	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.08	4.21	4.22	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	0	2	1	2.57	1386/1421	2.57	3.99	4.00	4.02	2.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1249/1365	3.25	3.88	4.08	4.09	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1284/1485	3.50	4.14	4.16	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.90	4.69	4.73	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1061/1483	3.71	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.71
T a shares														
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	2	2	4 00	1165/1425	4.01	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.86	620/1426	4.66	4.47	4.41	4.30	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	0	0	2	2	2		947/1418	4.00	4.07	4.09	4.72	
	4	0	0	1	1	1	⊿	$4.14 \\ 4.14$	947/1418	3.97	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.22 3.97
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.14				3.97		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	Τ	U	U	U	3	3	4.50	271/1199	4.37	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1312	****	4.09	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	4 00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 244	***	4.62	4.09	3.76	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 227	****	4.74	4.09	4.16	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	Τ.		****/ 225	***	4.74	4.40	3.81	***
		0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 207	***				***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	^^^^/ 20/	^ ^ ^ ^	4.50	4.09	3.69	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	***	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	****
<u> </u>														

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 10 2

I

?

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101

SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS

(Instr. C)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 185 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

General  1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 2 0 1 0 1 3 4 4.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.39 4.27 4.33 4.00 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 7. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 1 1 0 5 4.29 1015/1425 4.01 4.47 4.41 4.38 4.01 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9. O 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1310 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 ****  Discussion  D
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 1 0 1 0 1 3 4 4.00 1092/1504 4.00 4.39 4.27 4.33 4.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 2 0 3 2 2 3.22 1386/1503 3.22 4.23 4.20 4.18 3.22 4.21 1.00 2 2 3.43 1171/120 3.43 4.18 4.28 4.32 3.43 4.00 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 1 1 2 2 3.43 1171/120 3.43 4.18 4.28 4.32 3.43 4.00 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 1 1 2 2 3.43 1171/120 3.43 4.18 4.28 4.32 3.43 4.00 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 1 1 1 2 3 3.67 1229/1453 3.67 4.08 4.21 4.22 3.67 5.00 dassigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 3 1 0 2 1 2.57 1386/1421 2.57 3.99 4.00 4.02 2.57 6.0 davitten assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 1 2 2 3.25 1249/1365 3.25 3.88 4.08 4.09 3.25 7.0 Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 2 0 1 2 3 3.50 1244/1485 3.50 4.14 4.16 4.14 3.50 8.00 dother examination of the structor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 708/1504 4.88 4.90 4.09 4.73 4.88 9.0 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 543/1483 3.71 4.05 4.06 4.11 3.71 1.00 dother examination of the structor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 1 0 0 5 4.29 1015/1425 4.01 4.47 4.41 4.38 4.01 4.00 dother examination of the structor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 6 4.71 895/1426 4.66 4.67 4.69 4.72 4.66 3.00 dother examination of the structor's lectures explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 2 0 3 2 2 3.22 1386/1503 3.22 4.23 4.20 4.18 3.22 3.01 the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 1 1 2 2 3.43 1171/1290 3.43 4.18 4.28 4.32 3.43 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 1 1 1 3 3 3.67 1229/1453 3.67 4.08 4.21 4.22 3.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 3 1 0 2 1 2.57 1386/1421 2.57 3.99 4.00 4.02 2.57 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 1 2 2 3.25 1249/1365 3.25 3.88 4.08 4.09 3.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 2 0 1 2 1 2 2 3.25 1249/1365 3.50 4.14 4.16 4.14 3.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 708/1504 4.88 4.90 4.69 4.73 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 543/1483 3.71 4.05 4.06 4.11 3.71    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.71 895/1425 4.01 4.47 4.41 4.38 4.01 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 895/1426 4.66 4.67 4.69 4.72 4.66 3.97 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 429/1199 4.37 4.32 4.26 4.25 4.22 4.25 4.25 4.22 4.25 4.25 4.22 4.25 4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 3 3.43 1171/1290 3.43 4.18 4.28 4.32 3.43 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 1 1 1 3 3 3.67 1229/1453 3.67 4.08 4.21 4.22 3.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 3 1 0 2 1 2.57 1386/1421 2.57 3.99 4.00 4.02 2.57 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 1 2.57 1286/1421 2.57 3.99 4.00 4.02 2.57 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 1 2 2 3.25 1249/1365 3.25 3.88 4.08 4.09 3.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 1 2 1 2 3 3.50 1284/1485 3.50 4.14 4.16 4.14 3.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 708/1504 4.88 4.90 4.69 4.73 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 543/1483 3.71 4.05 4.06 4.11 3.71    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 1 0 5 4.29 1015/1425 4.01 4.47 4.41 4.38 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 1 1 1 1 3 3 3 3.67 1229/1453 3.67 4.08 4.21 4.22 3.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 3 1 0 2 1 2.57 1386/1421 2.57 3.99 4.00 4.02 2.57 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 1 2 1 2 2 3.25 1249/1365 3.25 3.88 4.08 4.09 3.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 1 2 1 2 3 3.50 1284/1485 3.50 4.14 4.16 4.14 3.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 708/1504 4.88 4.90 4.69 4.73 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 543/1483 3.71 4.05 4.06 4.11 3.71    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 1 0 5 4.29 1015/1425 4.01 4.47 4.41 4.38 4.01 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.71 895/1426 4.66 4.67 4.69 4.72 4.66 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 488/1418 4.22 4.28 4.25 4.25 4.22 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.14 961/1416 3.97 4.32 4.26 4.26 3.97 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 429/1199 4.37 4.13 3.97 4.05 4.37    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ***/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 **** 4.09 4.04 4.77 **** 4.09 4.09 4.07 4.77 **** 4.09 4.09 4.07 4.77 **** 4.09 4.09 4.07 4.77 **** 4.09 4.09 4.07 4.77 **** 4.09 4.09 4.07 4.77 **** 4.09 4.09 4.07 4.77 **** 4.09 4.09 4.07 4.77 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 4.77 **** 4.09 4
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 1 3 1 0 2 1 2.57 1386/1421 2.57 3.99 4.00 4.02 2.57 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 1 2 2 3.25 1249/1355 3.25 3.88 4.08 4.09 3.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 1 2 1 2 2 3.25 1249/1355 3.25 3.88 4.08 4.09 3.25 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 708/1504 4.88 4.90 4.69 4.73 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 543/1483 3.71 4.05 4.06 4.11 3.71 Lecture  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 1 0 5 4.29 1015/1425 4.01 4.47 4.41 4.38 4.01 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 895/1426 4.66 4.67 4.69 4.72 4.66 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 3 3 4 4.57 488/1418 4.22 4.28 4.25 4.25 4.25 4.25 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.14 961/1416 3.97 4.32 4.26 4.26 3.97 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 429/1199 4.37 4.13 3.97 4.05 4.37    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 **** 4.09 4.06 4.07 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 **** 4.09 4.06 4.07 **** 4.09 4.06 4.07 **** 4.09 4.06 4.07 **** 4.09 4.06 4.07 **** 4.09 4.06 4.07 **** 4.09 4.06 4.07 **** 4.09 4.07 **** 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09 4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 2 1 2 2 3.25 1249/1365 3.25 3.88 4.08 4.09 3.25 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 2 0 1 2 3 3.50 1284/1485 3.50 4.14 4.16 4.14 3.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 708/1504 4.88 4.90 4.69 4.73 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 543/1483 3.71 4.05 4.06 4.71 3.71    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 1 0 5 4.29 1015/1425 4.01 4.47 4.41 4.38 4.01 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 895/1426 4.66 4.67 4.69 4.72 4.66 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 488/1418 4.22 4.28 4.25 4.25 4.22 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.14 961/1416 3.97 4.32 4.26 4.26 3.97 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 429/1199 4.37 4.13 3.97 4.05 4.37    Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 **** 4.09 4.07 4.07 **** 4.09 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 2 0 1 2 3 3.50 1284/1485 3.50 4.14 4.16 4.14 3.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 708/1504 4.88 4.90 4.69 4.73 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 543/1483 3.71 4.05 4.06 4.11 3.71  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 1 0 5 4.29 1015/1425 4.01 4.47 4.41 4.38 4.01 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 895/1426 4.66 4.67 4.69 4.72 4.66 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 895/1426 4.66 4.67 4.69 4.72 4.66 3. Was lecture scontribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.14 961/1416 3.97 4.32 4.25 4.22 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.14 961/1416 3.97 4.32 4.26 4.26 3.97 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 429/1199 4.37 4.13 3.97 4.05 4.37  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.34 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1303 **** 4.29 4.25 4.38 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 9 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.17 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/233 **** 4.59 4.09 3.78 **** 4.59 4.09 3.78 **** 4.59 4.09 3.78 **** 4.59 4.09 3.78 **** 4.59 4.09 3.56 **** 3.00 ****/244 **** 4.62 4.09 3.56 **** 3.00 ****/247 **** 4.64 4.66 ****
8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 708/1504 4.88 4.90 4.69 4.73 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 543/1483 3.71 4.05 4.06 4.11 3.71  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 1 0 5 4.29 1015/1425 4.01 4.47 4.41 4.38 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 1 2 3 4.33 543/1483 3.71 4.05 4.06 4.11 3.71  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 1 0 5 4.29 1015/1425 4.01 4.47 4.41 4.38 4.01 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 1 0 6 4.71 895/1426 4.66 4.67 4.69 4.72 4.66 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 488/1418 4.22 4.28 4.25 4.25 4.22 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.14 961/1416 3.97 4.32 4.26 4.26 3.97 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 429/1199 4.37 4.13 3.97 4.05 4.37  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.34 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1303 **** 4.29 4.25 4.38 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 9 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.17 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/233 **** 4.59 4.09 3.78 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/244 **** 4.62 4.09 3.56 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.16 ****
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 1 0 5 4.29 1015/1425 4.01 4.47 4.41 4.38 4.01 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 895/1426 4.66 4.67 4.69 4.72 4.66 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 488/1418 4.22 4.28 4.25 4.25 4.22 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.14 961/1416 3.97 4.32 4.26 4.26 3.97 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 429/1199 4.37 4.13 3.97 4.05 4.37   Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.34 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.28 4.25 4.22 4.28 4.26 4.26 3.97 4.31 4.31 4.31 4.32 4.26 4.26 3.97 4.31 4.31 4.32 4.26 4.26 3.97 4.31 4.31 4.32 4.26 4.26 4.26 3.97 4.31 4.31 4.32 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.2
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 1 0 5 4.29 1015/1425 4.01 4.47 4.41 4.38 4.01 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 895/1426 4.66 4.67 4.69 4.72 4.66 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 488/1418 4.22 4.28 4.25 4.25 4.22 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.14 961/1416 3.97 4.32 4.26 4.26 3.97 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 429/1199 4.37 4.13 3.97 4.05 4.37   Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.34 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.28 4.25 4.22 4.28 4.26 4.26 3.97 4.31 4.31 4.31 4.32 4.26 4.26 3.97 4.31 4.31 4.32 4.26 4.26 3.97 4.31 4.31 4.32 4.26 4.26 4.26 3.97 4.31 4.31 4.32 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.26 4.2
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 895/1426 4.66 4.67 4.69 4.72 4.66 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 488/1418 4.22 4.28 4.25 4.25 4.22 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.14 961/1416 3.97 4.32 4.26 4.26 3.97 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 429/1199 4.37 4.13 3.97 4.05 4.37   Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.34 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1303 **** 4.29 4.25 4.38 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 **** 4.80 4.01 4.17 4.40 4.16 **** 4.80 4.01 4.16 **** 4.80 4.01 4.16 **** 4.80 4.01 4.16 **** 4.80 4.01 4.16 ****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 488/1418 4.22 4.28 4.25 4.22 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.14 961/1416 3.97 4.32 4.26 4.26 3.97 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 1 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 429/1199 4.37 4.13 3.97 4.05 4.37  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.34 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.38 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 9 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.17 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.17 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/758 *** 4.59 4.09 3.78 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/244 *** 4.62 4.09 3.56 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.16 ****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
Discussion  Discus
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.34 ****  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.38 ****  4. Were special techniques successful 9 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.17 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 3.78 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 3.56 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.16 ****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1312 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 ****  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.34 ****  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.38 ****  4. Were special techniques successful 9 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.17 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/233 **** 4.59 4.09 3.78 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/244 **** 4.62 4.09 3.56 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.16 ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1303 **** 4.39 4.24 4.34 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.38 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 9 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.17 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 3.78 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 3.56 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.16 ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1299 **** 4.29 4.25 4.38 **** 4. Were special techniques successful 9 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.17 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 3.78 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 3.56 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.16 ****
4. Were special techniques successful 9 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 758 **** 3.90 4.01 4.17 ****  Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 3.78 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 3.56 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.16 ****
Laboratory  1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 3.78 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 3.56 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.16 ****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 3.78 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 3.56 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.16 ****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.59 4.09 3.78 ****  2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 3.56 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.16 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 244 **** 4.62 4.09 3.56 ****  3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.16 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 227 **** 4.74 4.40 4.16 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 225 **** 4.71 4.23 3.81 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 207 **** 4.50 4.09 3.69 ****
Seminar  1 Were aggigned toping relevant to the appounded theme. 9 0 1 0 0 0 1 3 00 **** 76 **** 5 00 4 61 4 63 ****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9 0 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 / 70 5.00 4.01 4.05
2. Was the instructor available for individual accention 9 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 7 70 4.50 4.55 4.05
3. Did lescarch projects contribute to what you rearned 9 0 1 0 2.30 7 07 3.00 4.34 4.34
4. Dia presentations contribute to what you rearned
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 9 1 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 73 **** 5.00 4.17 4.29 ****

Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades			Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 10 2

I

?

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101

SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS

(Instr. D)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 186 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11

Title

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions				_	ncies	3	_		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	3	2	2		1386/1503	3.22	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1171/1290	3.43	4.18	4.28	4.32	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.08	4.21	4.22	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	0	2	1	2.57	1386/1421	2.57	3.99	4.00	4.02	2.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1249/1365	3.25	3.88	4.08	4.09	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1284/1485	3.50	4.14	4.16	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.90	4.69	4.73	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1302/1483	3.71	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1165/1425	4.01	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1073/1426	4.66	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	682/1418	4.22	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	1	3		1122/1416	3.97		4.26	4.26	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	271/1199	4.37	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.37
-1														
Discussion	_	•		•		•	_	- 00			4 00	4 00	4 0 0	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1312	****	4.09	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0 1	0	0	0 1	0	2		****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	Т	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	****/ 758		3.90	4.01	4.17	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	4 00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	3.69	****
3. Here requirements for tab reports ofearly specified		Ü	Ü	J	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 20,		1.50	1.05	3.03	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	***
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	***
		- D-1 L												

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 10 2

I

?

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A) Spring 2005

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned

JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Page 187

Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire														
			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	125/1503	4.88	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	152/1290	4.88	4.18	4.28	4.36	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1453	4.88	4.08	4.21	4.34	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1421	4.88	3.99	4.00	4.27	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1365	5.00	3.88	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1485	4.88	4.14	4.16	4.24	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	101/1483	4.86	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425	4.93	4.47	4.41	4.51	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	317/1418	4.61	4.28	4.25	4.36	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1416	4.68	4.32	4.26	4.38	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	177/1199	4.67	4.13	3.97	4.04	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.09	4.00	4.31	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.29	4.25	4.56	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	273/ 758		3.90	4.01	4.24	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.59	4.09	4.56	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	22/ 244	4.88	4.62	4.09	4.09	4.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.74	4.40	4.66	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.75	63/ 225	4.75	4.71	4.23	4.69	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	22/ 207		4.50		4.40	4.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	45/ 70	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.21	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	5.00	4.17	4.15	5.00
Field Work														
Field Work  1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	Ω	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50	5 00	5 00	1 12	A 21	5 00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/ 58	5.00	5.00		4.31 4.26	
				0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	5.00	4.23		5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44		5.00	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6 6	0	0	0	0	0 1	2 1	5.00 4.50	1/ 47 22/ 39		5.00	4.29	4.41	
3. Did conterences help you carry out flerd accivities	O	U	U	U	U	Т	Т	4.50	22/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.55	4.50
Self Paced	_	^		•	6		-	F 00		ale al colo de	also also de obje	4 50	4 25	

7 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 40 \*\*\*\* 4.53 4.37 \*\*\*\*

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	***	***	4.24	3.16	****

ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II

Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 187 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 8

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II Baltimore Count WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. B) Spring 2005

Page 188 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	9
Questionnaires:	8

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	125/1503	4.88	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	152/1290	4.88	4.18	4.28	4.36	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1453	4.88	4.08	4.21	4.34	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1421	4.88	3.99	4.00	4.27	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1365	5.00	3.88	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1485	4.88	4.14	4.16	4.24	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1483	4.86	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	4.93	4.47	4.41	4.51	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1418	4.61	4.28	4.25	4.36	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.68	4.32	4.26	4.38	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	4.67	4.13	3.97	4.04	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.09	4.00	4.31	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.29	4.25	4.56	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	3.90	4.01	4.24	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.59	4.09	4.56	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	22/ 244	4.88	4.62	4.09	4.09	4.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.74	4.40	4.66	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	63/ 225	4.75	4.71	4.23	4.69	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	22/ 207	4.88	4.50	4.09	4.40	4.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76		5.00	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	45/ 70	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.21	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	5.00	4.17	4.15	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44		5.00	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	22/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.55	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.37	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	20	***	***	4.24	3.16	****

Questionnaires: 8

ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II

Title

Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. B) Enrollment: 9

Page 188 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2005

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

Course-Section: BIOL 654 0101
Title VISION SCIENCE
Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYLL (Instr. A)

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2005

Page 189 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

		, ,			1 3	
Enrollment:	4					
Questionnaires:	4		Student C	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	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	889/1504	4.25	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.18	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	775/1453	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.34	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	548/1421	4.25	3.99	4.00	4.27	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	581/1365	4.25	3.88	4.08	4.35	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.14	4.16	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	784/1425	4.63	4.47	4.41	4.51	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1418	4.63	4.28	4.25	4.36	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.32	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	636/1199	4.25	4.13	3.97	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1070/1312	3.33	4.09	4.00	4.31	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful			0	0	1	1	0	3.50	580/ 758	3.50	3.90	4.01	4.24	3.50

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

Course-Section: BIOL 654 0101 Title VISION SCIENCE

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 190 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Instructor			Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	889/1504	4.25	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.18	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	775/1453	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.34	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	548/1421	4.25	3.99	4.00	4.27	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	581/1365	4.25	3.88	4.08	4.35	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.14	4.16	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.63	4.47	4.41	4.51	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	578/1418	4.63	4.28	4.25	4.36	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.32	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	271/1199	4.25	4.13	3.97	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1070/1312	3.33	4.09	4.00	4.31	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1 1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	580/ 758	3.50	3.90	4.01	4.24	3.50

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