

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	11	0	7	5	44	72	108	4.14	1085/1674	4.48	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	7	14	46	71	99	4.02	1139/1674	3.99	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.02	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	15	1	9	13	41	64	104	4.04	992/1423	3.97	4.01	4.27	4.16	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	96	5	10	32	40	53	3.90	1224/1609	4.01	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	4	7	10	32	60	121	4.21	603/1585	3.28	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	147	12	6	19	21	28	3.55	1273/1535	4.02	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	16	0	13	18	37	67	96	3.93	1188/1651	4.07	4.11	4.18	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	4	1	1	0	4	224	4.95	353/1673	4.95	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	58	3	4	8	42	86	46	3.87	1146/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	5	1	21	47	157	4.52	847/1586	4.79	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	4	0	6	38	184	4.72	1002/1585	4.86	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	7	11	48	65	96	4.02	1119/1582	4.36	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.02	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	3	7	11	31	69	106	4.14	1060/1575	4.59	4.07	4.27	4.17	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	5	8	8	32	60	118	4.20	531/1380	4.27	4.01	3.94	3.78	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	12	10	34	59	113	4.10	777/1520	4.34	3.91	4.01	3.76	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	6	11	38	48	125	4.21	939/1515	4.45	4.18	4.24	3.97	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	8	18	28	51	122	4.15	990/1511	4.15	4.04	4.27	4.00	4.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	33	12	14	30	59	79	3.92	549/ 994	3.77	3.92	3.94	3.73	3.92	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	227	9	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	****/ 265	****	4.36	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	233	0	4	1	4	3	2	2.86	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	231	8	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	****/ 260	****	4.60	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	231	8	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	232	7	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	****/ 233	****	4.10	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	230	10	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	234	7	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	233	9	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	234	3	1	2	2	3	2	3.30	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	233	4	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	236	0	3	2	3	1	2	2.73	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	237	0	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	235	6	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	235	6	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	235	7	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	233	0	2	0	5	4	3	3.43	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	232	0	1	3	2	1	8	3.80	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	233	6	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	234	6	1	3	2	0	1	2.57	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	233	6	1	3	3	0	1	2.63	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 247

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 165
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	66	0.00-0.99	8	A	40	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	45
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	1	B	69						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	12	C	78	General	2	Under-grad	247	Non-major	202
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	13	D	9						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	3	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	166				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0201
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 166
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	10	28	4.57	521/1674	4.48	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	14	22	4.38	763/1674	3.99	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	9	9	19	3.95	1061/1423	3.97	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	0	6	7	9	4.14	996/1609	4.01	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	4	6	6	9	9	3.38	1306/1585	3.28	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	****/1535	4.02	3.97	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	10	22	4.17	966/1651	4.07	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	42	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	1	0	3	17	13	4.21	783/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	5	33	4.82	354/1586	4.79	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	39	4.95	340/1585	4.86	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	4	11	24	4.43	748/1582	4.36	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	5	33	4.79	295/1575	4.59	4.07	4.27	4.17	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	2	4	32	4.72	167/1380	4.27	4.01	3.94	3.78	4.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	5	8	21	4.16	734/1520	4.34	3.91	4.01	3.76	4.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	3	4	11	19	4.16	966/1515	4.45	4.18	4.24	3.97	4.16	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	10	9	17	4.08	1027/1511	4.15	4.04	4.27	4.00	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	16	1	3	5	3	9	3.76	633/ 994	3.77	3.92	3.94	3.73	3.76	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.36	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.60	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.10	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0201
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 166
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	16	General	2	Under-grad	43	Non-major	36
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0202
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 167
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	1	16	4.52	582/1674	4.48	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	554/1674	3.99	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	5	12	4.29	819/1423	3.97	4.01	4.27	4.16	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	786/1609	4.01	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	1075/1585	3.28	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	870/1535	4.02	3.97	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	1	5	12	4.35	741/1651	4.07	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	796/1673	4.95	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	693/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	301/1586	4.79	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	20	4.86	689/1585	4.86	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	438/1582	4.36	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	565/1575	4.59	4.07	4.27	4.17	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	200/1380	4.27	4.01	3.94	3.78	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	1	14	4.50	397/1520	4.34	3.91	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	707/1515	4.45	4.18	4.24	3.97	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	602/1511	4.15	4.04	4.27	4.00	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	5	0	9	4.13	426/ 994	3.77	3.92	3.94	3.73	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.36	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.60	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.10	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0202
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 167
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0203
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 168
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	4.48	4.23	4.27	4.07	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1499/1674	3.99	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1423	3.97	4.01	4.27	4.16	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1609	4.01	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1572/1585	3.28	3.91	3.96	3.88	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1097/1651	4.07	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	4.79	4.38	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	4.86	4.54	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1582	4.36	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	4.59	4.07	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	666/1380	4.27	4.01	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.34	3.91	4.01	3.76	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	4.45	4.18	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1511	4.15	4.04	4.27	4.00	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	964/ 994	3.77	3.92	3.94	3.73	2.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0206
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 169
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	1036/1674	4.48	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1291/1674	3.99	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	7	4	3.81	1150/1423	3.97	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1431/1609	4.01	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	1	3	3	3	3.00	1440/1585	3.28	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1535	4.02	3.97	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	832/1651	4.07	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	778/1673	4.95	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1377/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	723/1586	4.79	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	786/1585	4.86	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	1061/1582	4.36	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	905/1575	4.59	4.07	4.27	4.17	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	4	6	5	3.88	817/1380	4.27	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	2	9	4.00	810/1520	4.34	3.91	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	889/1515	4.45	4.18	4.24	3.97	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	7	5	3.93	1112/1511	4.15	4.04	4.27	4.00	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	474/ 994	3.77	3.92	3.94	3.73	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.36	4.23	3.97	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	3.97	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.60	4.46	4.41	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.10	4.20	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0206
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 169
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0207
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 170
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	891/1674	4.48	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1568/1674	3.99	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	5	2	1	3.10	1354/1423	3.97	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1094/1609	4.01	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	5	0	1	2.50	1543/1585	3.28	3.91	3.96	3.88	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1535	4.02	3.97	4.08	3.89	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	1422/1651	4.07	4.11	4.18	4.10	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	0	3.88	1146/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	266/1586	4.79	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.86	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	935/1582	4.36	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	692/1575	4.59	4.07	4.27	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	303/1380	4.27	4.01	3.94	3.78	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1027/1520	4.34	3.91	4.01	3.76	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	898/1515	4.45	4.18	4.24	3.97	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1371/1511	4.15	4.04	4.27	4.00	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	3.77	3.92	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	445/1674	4.48	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	790/1674	3.99	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	962/1423	3.97	4.01	4.27	4.16	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	985/1609	4.01	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	692/1585	3.28	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	373/1535	4.02	3.97	4.08	3.89	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	0	1	8	4.18	945/1651	4.07	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1673	4.95	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	680/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	371/1586	4.79	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	786/1585	4.86	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	632/1582	4.36	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	407/1575	4.59	4.07	4.27	4.17	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	796/1380	4.27	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	134/1520	4.34	3.91	4.01	3.76	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	325/1515	4.45	4.18	4.24	3.97	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	563/1511	4.15	4.04	4.27	4.00	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	346/ 994	3.77	3.92	3.94	3.73	4.29	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	3.97	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 172
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0201
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 173
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.16	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1295/1535	3.50	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	955/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1129/1582	4.25	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	359/1575	4.00	4.07	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	489/1380	4.13	4.01	3.94	3.78	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1434/1520	2.75	3.91	4.01	3.76	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.18	4.24	3.97	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.04	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.92	3.94	3.73	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0201
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 174
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1016/1423	4.00	4.01	4.27	4.16	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	769/1585	4.00	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1295/1535	3.50	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	496/1586	4.75	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.75	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1582	4.25	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1445/1575	4.00	4.07	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	666/1380	4.13	4.01	3.94	3.78	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	1434/1520	2.75	3.91	4.01	3.76	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.18	4.24	3.97	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.04	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.92	3.94	3.73	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 175
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	1	5	6	7	3.48	1521/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	6	8	3.61	1451/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	7	7	3.70	1197/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	4	10	4	3.59	1415/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	5	3	8	3.57	1181/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	8	6	4	3.26	1382/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	7	5	6	3.55	1426/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	353/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	3	1	1	10	2	2	3.19	1500/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	8	7	4	3.48	1485/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	4	3	7	7	3.57	1548/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	3.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	8	11	1	3.35	1455/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	2	6	7	2	3.39	1408/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	3.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	2	7	6	4	3.27	1152/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.49	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	8	3	4	3.15	1318/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	3.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	4	6	1	5	2.95	1432/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	2.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	2	5	6	2	2.90	1447/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	2.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	3	1	6	3	1	2.86	930/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	2.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	2	1	4	3	13	4.04	175/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.04	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	3	5	7	7	3.70	229/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	3.70	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	5	5	12	4.17	202/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.17	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	2	4	4	12	4.04	188/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.04	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	1	0	5	7	9	4.05	146/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	4.05	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	2	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	2	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	4	0	0	2.80	****/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	44/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	3.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	40/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	3.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 175
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 176
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	1	5	6	7	3.48	1521/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	6	8	3.61	1451/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	7	7	3.70	1197/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	4	10	4	3.59	1415/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	5	3	8	3.57	1181/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	8	6	4	3.26	1382/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	7	5	6	3.55	1426/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	353/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1444/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1300/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	3.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1448/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	3.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1043/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1395/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	3.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	1	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	930/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.49	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	8	3	4	3.15	1318/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	3.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	4	4	6	1	5	2.95	1432/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	2.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	2	5	6	2	2.90	1447/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	2.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	3	1	6	3	1	2.86	930/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	2.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	2	1	4	3	13	4.04	175/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.04	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	3	5	7	7	3.70	229/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	3.70	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	5	5	12	4.17	202/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.17	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	1	2	4	4	12	4.04	188/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.04	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	1	0	5	7	9	4.05	146/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	4.05	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	2	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	****/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	2	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	4	0	0	2.80	****/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	44/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	3.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	40/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	3.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 176
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0102
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 177
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	9	9	2	3.35	1561/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	7	8	3.87	1298/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	10	8	3.92	1097/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	7	5	8	3.90	1224/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	13	4.33	482/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	7	6	6	3.57	1262/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	6	3	11	3.79	1296/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	832/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	2	9	8	0	3.20	1494/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	7	11	4.32	1094/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	7	6	10	4.13	1444/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	5	5	10	4.05	1109/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	0	4	9	4	3.68	1322/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	2	5	3	9	3.59	1001/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	2	4	2	1	2.67	1453/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	5	0	4	2	1	2.50	1470/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	5	1	2	4	0	2.42	1483/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	2.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	2	8	7	4.11	170/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	104/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	71/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	55/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	108/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	****/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0102
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 177
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0102
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 178
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	9	9	2	3.35	1561/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	7	8	3.87	1298/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	10	8	3.92	1097/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	7	5	8	3.90	1224/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	13	4.33	482/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	7	6	6	3.57	1262/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	6	3	11	3.79	1296/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	832/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	****/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	336/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1025/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	2	4	2	1	2.67	1453/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	5	0	4	2	1	2.50	1470/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	5	1	2	4	0	2.42	1483/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	2.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	2	8	7	4.11	170/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.11	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	104/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.44	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	71/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	55/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	108/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	****/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0102
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 178
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0103
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 179
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	13	4	3.90	1322/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	10	7	4.10	1083/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	12	9	4.43	672/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	4.43		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	6	8	5	3.95	1172/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	395/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	4	7	6	3.89	1030/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	966/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	0	0	8	2	2	3.50	1377/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	4	3	9	4.06	1275/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	1509/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	3.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	7	6	4	3.72	1320/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	3.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	6	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1216/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	5	7	2	3.79	880/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	1	4	5	3.69	1074/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	3	2	5	3.62	1270/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	3.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	2	3	2	4	3.31	1359/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	3.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	708/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	3.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	120/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.40	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	43/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	68/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	51/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.79	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	104/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	4.36	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0103
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 179
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0104
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 180
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	3	6	7	2	3.10	1617/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	7	4	4	4	3.05	1604/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	6	4	5	6	3.52	1264/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	8	3	3.52	1443/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	2	5	8	3.52	1211/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	6	4	5	3.24	1394/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	5	4	5	3.24	1529/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	3.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	796/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	4	3	5	2	0	2.36	1630/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	2.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	6	7	4	3.43	1495/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	3.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	5	5	1	8	3.38	1560/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	3.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	7	4	4	3	2.86	1536/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	2.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	10	2	5	3	0	2.05	1561/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	2.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	7	4	6	2	2	2.43	1335/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	2.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	4	2	3	1	3	2.77	1432/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	2.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	4	2	4	0	3	2.69	1465/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	2.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	6	3	0	2	2	2.31	1489/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	2.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	132/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	120/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.39	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	0	5	12	4.50	137/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	55/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	3	2	7	5	3.67	196/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	1	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	89/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	3.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	3	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	101/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	2.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	3	0	1	4	0	1	3.17	88/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	3.17	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	3	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	93/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	3.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	2	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	87/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	3.29	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	2	0	3	1	2.67	70/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	2.67	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	3	0	1	3	2	3.11	62/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	3.11	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	4	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	6	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	0	2	0	2	2.33	59/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	2.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	3	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	40/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	3.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	4	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	4	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0104
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 180
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0105
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 181
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	6	8	3.89	1328/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	8	9	4.26	919/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	986/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	7	9	4.11	1029/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	502/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	7	8	4.00	870/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	901/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	832/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1215/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	974/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	1	5	10	4.11	1455/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	924/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	3	5	7	3.88	1225/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	9	7	4.17	567/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	6	2	3.50	1169/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	1024/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1024/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	474/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	54/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.69	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	67/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	77/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	24/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.94	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	99/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0105
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 181
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0106
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 182
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	6	10	4.24	979/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	7	4.14	1043/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	962/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	8	10	4.19	930/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	14	4.43	395/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	5	10	3.90	1022/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	11	6	3.90	1228/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	353/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	4	0	1	8	3	2	3.43	1412/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	1176/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	1489/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	3.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	4	9	4	3.60	1371/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	3	4	2	5	3.31	1429/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	3.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	0	2	5	9	3.89	803/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	397/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	1227/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	0	3	6	4.00	1050/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	302/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	4.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	0	1	1	17	4.65	61/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.65	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	41/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	94/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	35/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	1	2	0	4	13	4.30	115/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	4.30	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0106
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 182
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0107
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 183
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	6	3	9	3	3.43	1538/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	6	6	4	3.38	1544/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	5	7	3.57	1254/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	4	6	3.62	1405/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	652/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	7	6	3	3.42	1324/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	5	2	11	4.10	1031/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	424/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	1	7	4	0	2.93	1572/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	2.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	5	6	5	3.58	1466/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	3.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	4	3	7	3	3.26	1567/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	3.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	5	2	7	3	3.21	1478/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	3.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	5	6	0	3	5	1	2.67	1538/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	2.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	3	3	3	3	4	3.13	1202/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	1	4	3	3.45	1195/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	3.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	0	4	3	1	2.91	1445/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	2.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	2	3	2	1	2.80	1462/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	3	0	2	0	2.80	****/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	178/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	142/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	154/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.43	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	2	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	89/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	134/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	4.14	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0107
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 183
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0201
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 184
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	5	5	4	1	2.63	1658/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	2.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	4	4	4	2	2.68	1651/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	2.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	6	5	2	3.11	1352/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	6	3	4	2	2	2.47	1604/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	2.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	4	6	3	3.28	1356/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	3	4	4	2	2.72	1495/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	2.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	6	3	3	1	2.32	1624/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	2.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	3	1	9	0	1	2.64	1612/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	2.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	8	4	2	3.11	1531/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	2.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	4	6	6	3.89	1509/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	3.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	2	4	5	3	3.06	1499/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	2.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	8	3	2	3.06	1480/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	2.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	4	3	2	5	3	3.00	1217/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	3	0	3	0	2.09	1502/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	2.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	4	3	2	2	0	2.18	1488/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	2.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	4	3	0	0	1.91	1504/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	1.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	977/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	2	1	5	6	5	3.58	225/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	3.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	3	2	3	6	5	3.42	250/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	3.42	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	180/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.32	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	4	5	1	5	4	3.00	251/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	5	6	1	2	5	2.79	230/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	2.79	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	2	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	71/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	2.20	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	69/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	2.80	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0201
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 184
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0201
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 185
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	5	5	4	1	2.63	1658/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	2.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	4	4	4	2	2.68	1651/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	2.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	6	5	2	3.11	1352/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	6	3	4	2	2	2.47	1604/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	2.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	4	6	3	3.28	1356/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	3	4	4	2	2.72	1495/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	2.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	6	3	3	1	2.32	1624/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	2.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	7	3	3	1	0	1.86	1649/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	2.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	4	4	2	2	0	2.17	1577/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	2.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1552/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	3.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	3	5	2	2	0	2.25	1575/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	2.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	2	4	2	3	0	0	1.89	1569/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	2.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	3	0	3	0	2.09	1502/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	2.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	4	3	2	2	0	2.18	1488/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	2.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	4	4	3	0	0	1.91	1504/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	1.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	977/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	2.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	2	1	5	6	5	3.58	225/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	3.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	3	2	3	6	5	3.42	250/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	3.42	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	180/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.32	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	4	5	1	5	4	3.00	251/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	5	6	1	2	5	2.79	230/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	2.79	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	2	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	71/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	2.20	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	69/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	2.80	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0201
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 185
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0202
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 186
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	6	7	5	3.79	1393/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	13	2	3.84	1312/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	7	4	3.68	1203/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	10	4	2	3.16	1539/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	769/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	5	3	7	3	3.32	1362/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	5	2	8	3.74	1338/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	3.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	424/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	3	6	5	1	3.13	1519/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	7	7	4.00	1300/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	1392/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	10	4	3.84	1250/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	2	7	5	3.42	1395/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	3.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	9	3	3	3.28	1152/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	6	4	3	3.64	1104/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	4	3	3	2	2.93	1440/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	2.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	0	7	2	0	2.43	1482/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	2.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	1	4	2	1	3.11	871/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	3.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	194/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	3.94	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	217/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	3.81	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	126/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	223/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	3.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	3	5	4	3	3.31	215/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	3.31	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	2	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	2	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	3	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	48/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	3.60	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	48/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	3.60	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	4	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	52/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	3.17	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	52/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	2.80	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	3	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	32/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	3.20	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	28/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	3.20	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0202
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 186
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0203
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 187
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	5	8	3.95	1259/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	9	4	3.70	1401/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	8	7	3.90	1107/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	905/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	8	10	4.35	462/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	8	6	3.95	946/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	5	14	4.60	393/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	706/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	2	8	6	0	3.12	1522/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	1243/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	3	11	4.33	1354/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	9	3	3.78	1290/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	1350/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	3	2	5	4	3.38	1108/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1169/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1282/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1396/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	5	4	10	4.26	144/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.26	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	147/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.26	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	124/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.58	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	2	1	9	7	4.11	185/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.11	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	3	1	5	10	4.16	132/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	4.16	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	8

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0204
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 188
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	5	5	8	3.57	1492/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	8	6	6	3.61	1451/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	10	3	8	3.74	1180/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	6	8	5	3.59	1415/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	6	4	9	3.90	907/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	8	6	3.71	1177/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	5	5	7	3.75	1324/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	796/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	14	3	0	3.11	1522/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	1217/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.16	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	4	2	7	6	3.65	1540/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	3.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	2	10	5	3.89	1222/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	4	3	2	5	5	1	2.94	1508/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	2.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	2	4	1	8	3	3.33	1127/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	1	2	5	0	2.67	1453/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	3	2	4	2	0	2.45	1476/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	2.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	2	4	3	0	2.73	1469/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	2.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	7	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	175/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.06	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	3	9	5	3.94	200/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	3.94	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	71/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	1	3	4	4	5	3.53	234/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	3.53	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	2	3	2	9	3.94	161/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	3.94	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0204
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 188
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0205
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 189
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	4	6	9	3.86	1347/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	11	4.14	1051/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	12	4.23	870/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	3	6	8	3.90	1224/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	10	6	4.10	702/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	5	9	3.95	946/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	7	3	9	3.86	1258/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	706/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	4	0	0	6	8	0	3.57	1344/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	5	13	4.38	1024/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	4	5	11	4.19	1423/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.19	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	4	11	4.14	1043/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	6	4	6	3.63	1339/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	4	6	7	3.89	803/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	734/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	1125/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	3.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1139/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	638/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	3	1	11	4.38	125/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	122/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.38	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	119/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	159/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	2	3	1	10	4.19	126/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	4.19	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0205
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 189
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0206
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 190
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	1	7	5	8	3.82	1378/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	3	5	8	5	3.59	1455/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	2	1	10	7	3.82	1150/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	7	7	6	3.77	1306/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	1	1	12	5	3.95	838/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	7	9	3	3.62	1234/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	1	2	4	12	4.25	866/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	353/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	0	11	3	3	3.26	1470/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	5	5	10	4.00	1300/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	5	11	4	3.77	1527/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	3.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	9	7	3	3.41	1442/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	2.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	6	9	2	3.29	1437/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	3.02	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	3	3	7	6	3.57	1009/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1169/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	4	0	4	3.50	1303/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	3	0	3	3	1	2.90	1447/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	2.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	168/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.13	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	178/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	60/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.81	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	3	0	4	3	6	3.56	231/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	3.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	3	0	2	3	8	3.81	182/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	3.81	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0206
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 190
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0206
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 191
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	1	7	5	8	3.82	1378/1674	3.55	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	3	5	8	5	3.59	1455/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	2	1	10	7	3.82	1150/1423	3.78	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	7	7	6	3.77	1306/1609	3.63	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	1	1	12	5	3.95	838/1585	3.97	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	7	9	3	3.62	1234/1535	3.51	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	1	2	4	12	4.25	866/1651	3.73	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	353/1673	4.92	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	2	0	4	2	1	3.00	1540/1656	3.09	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1504/1586	3.86	4.38	4.43	4.37	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	2	2	1	3	0	2.63	1581/1585	3.79	4.54	4.69	4.60	3.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	1	3	3	1	0	2.50	1564/1582	3.54	4.09	4.26	4.17	2.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	3	1	0	3	1	2.75	1532/1575	3.18	4.07	4.27	4.17	3.02	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	1	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	1082/1380	3.46	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1169/1520	3.22	3.91	4.01	3.76	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	4	0	4	3.50	1303/1515	3.06	4.18	4.24	3.97	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	3	0	3	3	1	2.90	1447/1511	2.88	4.04	4.27	4.00	2.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	881/ 994	3.14	3.92	3.94	3.73	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	168/ 265	4.14	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.13	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	178/ 278	4.15	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.13	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	60/ 260	4.58	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.81	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	3	0	4	3	6	3.56	231/ 259	4.14	4.42	4.33	4.19	3.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	3	0	2	3	8	3.81	182/ 233	3.91	4.10	4.20	4.00	3.81	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	3.50	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	2.67	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	3.17	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	3.00	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	3.29	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	2.67	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	3.08	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	3.13	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	3.33	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	3.20	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	3.20	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0206
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 191
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 106 0101
 Title THE HUMAN ORGANISM
 Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E
 Enrollment: 121
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 192
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	7	10	13	3.88	1334/1674	3.88	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	9	10	8	3.47	1511/1674	3.47	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	7	7	7	10	3.35	1311/1423	3.35	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	2	4	4	2	6	3.33	1500/1609	3.33	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	7	9	14	3.91	893/1585	3.91	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	25	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1317/1535	3.44	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	9	17	4.21	912/1651	4.21	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	283/1673	4.97	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	3	1	12	10	4	3.37	1434/1656	3.37	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	2	10	19	4.29	1112/1586	4.29	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	6	23	4.50	1225/1585	4.50	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	8	9	12	3.82	1266/1582	3.82	4.09	4.26	4.17	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	11	7	10	3.63	1343/1575	3.63	4.07	4.27	4.17	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	5	10	16	4.18	549/1380	4.18	4.01	3.94	3.78	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	5	2	6	3	4	2.95	1384/1520	2.95	3.91	4.01	3.76	2.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	3	5	2	3	6	3.21	1390/1515	3.21	4.18	4.24	3.97	3.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	5	1	1	5	7	3.42	1328/1511	3.42	4.04	4.27	4.00	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	12	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	****/ 994	****	3.92	3.94	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 1	Required for Majors 27	Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 4	C 19	General 2	Under-grad 33 Non-major 34
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 5	F 1	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 2		

Course-Section: BIOL 106H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 193
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.08	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.01	4.27	4.16	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	557/1585	4.25	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	870/1535	4.00	3.97	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	917/1585	4.63	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	935/1582	4.38	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	958/1575	4.13	4.07	4.27	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	962/1380	3.58	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	397/1520	4.50	3.91	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.18	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.04	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.92	3.94	3.73	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 106H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 194
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	954/1674	4.25	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.08	4.23	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.01	4.27	4.16	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	557/1585	4.25	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	870/1535	4.00	3.97	4.08	3.89	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	955/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1225/1585	4.63	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1582	4.38	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1138/1575	4.13	4.07	4.27	4.17	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1036/1380	3.58	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	397/1520	4.50	3.91	4.01	3.76	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.18	4.24	3.97	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.04	4.27	4.00	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.92	3.94	3.73	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 109 0101
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 195
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	8	2	3.65	1459/1674	3.94	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	10	3	3.88	1284/1674	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	7	3	3.41	1296/1423	3.75	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	952/1609	4.21	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	1404/1585	3.57	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	3	4	5	3.67	1207/1535	4.02	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	2	13	4.53	497/1651	4.43	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	3	7	2	3.64	1308/1656	3.88	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	795/1586	4.70	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	1024/1585	4.65	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	808/1582	4.31	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	1020/1575	4.25	4.07	4.27	4.17	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	2	5	5	3.73	916/1380	3.88	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1295/1520	3.65	3.91	4.01	3.76	3.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1253/1515	4.02	4.18	4.24	3.97	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	896/1511	4.17	4.04	4.27	4.00	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 994	4.42	3.92	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	93/ 265	4.47	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	110/ 278	4.39	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	186/ 260	4.53	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.29	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	75/ 259	4.68	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	64/ 233	4.64	4.10	4.20	4.00	4.57	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 109 0101
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 195
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 109 0102
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 196
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	8	6	3.80	1385/1674	3.94	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	6	5	6	3.74	1382/1674	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	6	4	4	3.32	1320/1423	3.75	4.01	4.27	4.16	3.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	8	6	3.95	1172/1609	4.21	4.10	4.22	4.05	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	3	0	4	4	4	3.40	1297/1585	3.57	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	9	5	3.84	1074/1535	4.02	3.97	4.08	3.89	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	795/1651	4.43	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	724/1673	4.97	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1073/1656	3.88	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	633/1586	4.70	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1106/1585	4.65	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	819/1582	4.31	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	949/1575	4.25	4.07	4.27	4.17	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	666/1380	3.88	4.01	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	0	2	1	5	3.45	1195/1520	3.65	3.91	4.01	3.76	3.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	3	0	2	5	3.64	1263/1515	4.02	4.18	4.24	3.97	3.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	1024/1511	4.17	4.04	4.27	4.00	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	322/ 994	4.42	3.92	3.94	3.73	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	123/ 265	4.47	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.38	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	183/ 278	4.39	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.08	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	131/ 260	4.53	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.54	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	111/ 259	4.68	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.54	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	97/ 233	4.64	4.10	4.20	4.00	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 1
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	19
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 20
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 109 0103
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 197
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	1036/1674	3.94	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	578/1674	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	980/1423	3.75	4.01	4.27	4.16	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	687/1609	4.21	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	769/1585	3.57	3.91	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	467/1535	4.02	3.97	4.08	3.89	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	231/1651	4.43	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	918/1656	3.88	3.87	4.07	3.96	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	371/1586	4.70	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	811/1585	4.65	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	808/1582	4.31	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	10	4.31	905/1575	4.25	4.07	4.27	4.17	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	540/1380	3.88	4.01	3.94	3.78	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	924/1520	3.65	3.91	4.01	3.76	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	594/1515	4.02	4.18	4.24	3.97	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	788/1511	4.17	4.04	4.27	4.00	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 994	4.42	3.92	3.94	3.73	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	59/ 265	4.47	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	32/ 278	4.39	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	56/ 260	4.53	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	31/ 259	4.68	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.92	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	30/ 233	4.64	4.10	4.20	4.00	4.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 109 0104
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 198
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1105/1674	3.94	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1284/1674	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.16	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	870/1423	3.75	4.01	4.27	4.16	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	743/1609	4.21	4.10	4.22	4.05	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1084/1585	3.57	3.91	3.96	3.88	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	807/1535	4.02	3.97	4.08	3.89	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1020/1651	4.43	4.11	4.18	4.10	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	4.97	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1162/1656	3.88	3.87	4.07	3.96	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	496/1586	4.70	4.38	4.43	4.37	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1275/1585	4.65	4.54	4.69	4.60	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1070/1582	4.31	4.09	4.26	4.17	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	983/1575	4.25	4.07	4.27	4.17	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1009/1380	3.88	4.01	3.94	3.78	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	810/1520	3.65	3.91	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	898/1515	4.02	4.18	4.24	3.97	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.17	4.04	4.27	4.00	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	205/ 994	4.42	3.92	3.94	3.73	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	132/ 265	4.47	4.36	4.23	3.97	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	157/ 278	4.39	4.34	4.19	3.97	4.22	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	150/ 260	4.53	4.60	4.46	4.41	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	109/ 259	4.68	4.42	4.33	4.19	4.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	37/ 233	4.64	4.10	4.20	4.00	4.78	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 109 0104
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 198
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	4	5	50	4.78	276/1674	4.78	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	7	7	43	4.53	554/1674	4.53	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	10	8	40	4.47	611/1423	4.47	4.01	4.27	4.36	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	37	0	2	3	4	14	4.30	786/1609	4.30	4.10	4.22	4.23	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	1	1	6	10	38	4.48	343/1585	4.48	3.91	3.96	3.91	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	47	0	2	0	1	9	4.42	****/1535	****	3.97	4.08	4.03	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	4	12	43	4.66	330/1651	4.66	4.11	4.18	4.20	4.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	58	4.98	142/1673	4.98	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	10	14	28	4.30	655/1656	4.30	3.87	4.07	4.10	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	3	14	41	4.59	763/1586	4.59	4.38	4.43	4.48	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	56	4.93	397/1585	4.93	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	6	13	38	4.52	621/1582	4.52	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	7	49	4.76	343/1575	4.76	4.07	4.27	4.39	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	19	0	2	8	9	21	4.22	514/1380	4.23	4.01	3.94	4.03	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	****/1520	****	3.91	4.01	4.03	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	****/1515	****	4.18	4.24	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	50	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	****/1511	****	4.04	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	50	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 994	****	3.92	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.36	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 260	****	4.60	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.42	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	4.20	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 21	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 8
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B 16			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C 10	General 7	Under-grad 63	Non-major 55
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	12	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 39		
				? 2			

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 200
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	148/1674	4.85	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	471/1674	4.62	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	575/1423	4.48	4.01	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	687/1609	4.44	4.10	4.22	4.23	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	191/1585	4.55	3.91	3.96	3.91	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	260/1535	4.04	3.97	4.08	4.03	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	673/1651	4.57	4.11	4.18	4.20	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	693/1656	4.14	3.87	4.07	4.10	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	538/1586	4.64	4.38	4.43	4.48	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	340/1585	4.82	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	748/1582	4.52	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	467/1575	4.61	4.07	4.27	4.39	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	348/1380	4.37	4.01	3.94	4.03	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1520	4.42	3.91	4.01	4.03	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	873/1515	4.62	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	865/1511	4.28	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	205/ 994	4.45	3.92	3.94	3.98	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	40/ 265	4.76	4.36	4.23	4.34	4.76	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	27/ 278	4.87	4.34	4.19	4.36	4.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	92/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.51	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	79/ 259	4.72	4.42	4.33	4.42	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	12	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 233	4.75	4.10	4.20	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 201
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	148/1674	4.85	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	471/1674	4.62	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	575/1423	4.48	4.01	4.27	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	687/1609	4.44	4.10	4.22	4.23	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	191/1585	4.55	3.91	3.96	3.91	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	260/1535	4.04	3.97	4.08	4.03	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	673/1651	4.57	4.11	4.18	4.20	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	2	9	3	3.93	1073/1656	4.14	3.87	4.07	4.10	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	371/1586	4.64	4.38	4.43	4.48	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1585	4.82	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	481/1582	4.52	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	359/1575	4.61	4.07	4.27	4.39	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1380	4.37	4.01	3.94	4.03	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1520	4.42	3.91	4.01	4.03	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	873/1515	4.62	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	865/1511	4.28	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	205/ 994	4.45	3.92	3.94	3.98	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	40/ 265	4.76	4.36	4.23	4.34	4.76	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	27/ 278	4.87	4.34	4.19	4.36	4.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	92/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.51	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	79/ 259	4.72	4.42	4.33	4.42	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	12	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 233	4.75	4.10	4.20	4.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0102
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 202
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	195/1674	4.85	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	578/1674	4.62	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	894/1423	4.48	4.01	4.27	4.36	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1029/1609	4.44	4.10	4.22	4.23	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	1	15	4.45	378/1585	4.55	3.91	3.96	3.91	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	817/1535	4.04	3.97	4.08	4.03	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	15	4.50	524/1651	4.57	4.11	4.18	4.20	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	805/1656	4.14	3.87	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	795/1586	4.64	4.38	4.43	4.48	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	917/1585	4.82	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	632/1582	4.52	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	1	12	4.44	780/1575	4.61	4.07	4.27	4.39	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	489/1380	4.37	4.01	3.94	4.03	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	489/1520	4.42	3.91	4.01	4.03	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	432/1515	4.62	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	865/1511	4.28	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	4.45	3.92	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 265	4.76	4.36	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	23/ 278	4.87	4.34	4.19	4.36	4.92	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	56/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.51	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	42/ 259	4.72	4.42	4.33	4.42	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	4.75	4.10	4.20	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 18		
				? 1			

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0102
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 203
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	195/1674	4.85	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	578/1674	4.62	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	894/1423	4.48	4.01	4.27	4.36	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1029/1609	4.44	4.10	4.22	4.23	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	1	15	4.45	378/1585	4.55	3.91	3.96	3.91	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	817/1535	4.04	3.97	4.08	4.03	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	15	4.50	524/1651	4.57	4.11	4.18	4.20	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	3	7	1	3.82	1192/1656	4.14	3.87	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	723/1586	4.64	4.38	4.43	4.48	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1118/1585	4.82	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	632/1582	4.52	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	551/1575	4.61	4.07	4.27	4.39	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1380	4.37	4.01	3.94	4.03	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	489/1520	4.42	3.91	4.01	4.03	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	432/1515	4.62	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	865/1511	4.28	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 994	4.45	3.92	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 265	4.76	4.36	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	23/ 278	4.87	4.34	4.19	4.36	4.92	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	56/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.51	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	42/ 259	4.72	4.42	4.33	4.42	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	4.75	4.10	4.20	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 18		
				? 1			

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0103
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 204
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	186/1674	4.85	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	379/1674	4.62	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	540/1423	4.48	4.01	4.27	4.36	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	343/1609	4.44	4.10	4.22	4.23	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	360/1585	4.55	3.91	3.96	3.91	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1066/1535	4.04	3.97	4.08	4.03	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	175/1651	4.57	4.11	4.18	4.20	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	522/1656	4.14	3.87	4.07	4.10	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	431/1586	4.64	4.38	4.43	4.48	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	689/1585	4.82	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	510/1582	4.52	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	423/1575	4.61	4.07	4.27	4.39	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	567/1380	4.37	4.01	3.94	4.03	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	810/1520	4.42	3.91	4.01	4.03	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	483/1515	4.62	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	976/1511	4.28	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	287/ 994	4.45	3.92	3.94	3.98	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	59/ 265	4.76	4.36	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	32/ 278	4.87	4.34	4.19	4.36	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	122/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.51	4.58	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	62/ 259	4.72	4.42	4.33	4.42	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	41/ 233	4.75	4.10	4.20	4.48	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0103
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 205
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	186/1674	4.85	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	379/1674	4.62	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	540/1423	4.48	4.01	4.27	4.36	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	343/1609	4.44	4.10	4.22	4.23	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	360/1585	4.55	3.91	3.96	3.91	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1066/1535	4.04	3.97	4.08	4.03	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	175/1651	4.57	4.11	4.18	4.20	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	522/1656	4.14	3.87	4.07	4.10	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	774/1586	4.64	4.38	4.43	4.48	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	453/1585	4.82	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	438/1582	4.52	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	601/1575	4.61	4.07	4.27	4.39	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	567/1380	4.37	4.01	3.94	4.03	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	810/1520	4.42	3.91	4.01	4.03	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	483/1515	4.62	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	976/1511	4.28	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	287/ 994	4.45	3.92	3.94	3.98	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	59/ 265	4.76	4.36	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	32/ 278	4.87	4.34	4.19	4.36	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	122/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.51	4.58	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	62/ 259	4.72	4.42	4.33	4.42	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	41/ 233	4.75	4.10	4.20	4.48	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0104
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 206
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	265/1674	4.85	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	292/1674	4.62	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	349/1423	4.48	4.01	4.27	4.36	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	312/1609	4.44	4.10	4.22	4.23	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	277/1585	4.55	3.91	3.96	3.91	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	1256/1535	4.04	3.97	4.08	4.03	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	432/1651	4.57	4.11	4.18	4.20	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	345/1656	4.14	3.87	4.07	4.10	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	738/1586	4.64	4.38	4.43	4.48	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1585	4.82	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	380/1582	4.52	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	343/1575	4.61	4.07	4.27	4.39	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	103/1380	4.37	4.01	3.94	4.03	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	512/1520	4.42	3.91	4.01	4.03	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	325/1515	4.62	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1511	4.28	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	4.45	3.92	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	74/ 265	4.76	4.36	4.23	4.34	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	29/ 278	4.87	4.34	4.19	4.36	4.87	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	159/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.51	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	104/ 259	4.72	4.42	4.33	4.42	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	4.75	4.10	4.20	4.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	4.20	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0104
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 207
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	265/1674	4.85	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	292/1674	4.62	4.08	4.23	4.26	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	349/1423	4.48	4.01	4.27	4.36	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	312/1609	4.44	4.10	4.22	4.23	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	277/1585	4.55	3.91	3.96	3.91	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	1256/1535	4.04	3.97	4.08	4.03	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	432/1651	4.57	4.11	4.18	4.20	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	7	1	3.57	1344/1656	4.14	3.87	4.07	4.10	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	974/1586	4.64	4.38	4.43	4.48	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1275/1585	4.82	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1061/1582	4.52	4.09	4.26	4.35	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	886/1575	4.61	4.07	4.27	4.39	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1380	4.37	4.01	3.94	4.03	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	512/1520	4.42	3.91	4.01	4.03	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	325/1515	4.62	4.18	4.24	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1511	4.28	4.04	4.27	4.28	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	4.45	3.92	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	74/ 265	4.76	4.36	4.23	4.34	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	29/ 278	4.87	4.34	4.19	4.36	4.87	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	159/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.51	4.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	104/ 259	4.72	4.42	4.33	4.42	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	4.75	4.10	4.20	4.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	4.20	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: OMLAND, KEVIN E (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 237
 Questionnaires: 96

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 208
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	18	37	38	4.22	1004/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	3	20	34	34	4.09	1090/1674	4.09	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	5	14	44	29	4.02	1004/1423	4.02	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	51	1	3	13	13	12	3.76	1313/1609	3.76	4.10	4.22	4.27	3.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	13	10	24	24	20	3.31	1344/1585	3.31	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	69	2	2	4	8	8	3.75	1147/1535	3.75	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	15	31	46	4.30	809/1651	4.30	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	89	4.97	283/1673	4.97	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	33	1	1	4	20	28	9	3.65	1308/1656	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	1	6	24	43	4.47	901/1586	4.47	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	4	13	55	4.71	1024/1585	4.69	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	1	1	14	23	32	4.18	1007/1582	4.20	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	4	10	17	39	4.30	915/1575	4.28	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	5	3	5	7	20	30	4.06	639/1380	4.11	4.01	3.94	4.01	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	2	5	15	22	4.22	673/1520	4.22	3.91	4.01	4.09	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	0	1	5	10	30	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	50	0	0	0	3	13	30	4.59	578/1511	4.59	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	50	11	0	1	4	13	17	4.31	332/ 994	4.31	3.92	3.94	3.96	4.31	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	95	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	95	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.60	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	95	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	95	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.10	4.20	4.18	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	95	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 30	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 36
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B 33			
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	8	C 13	General 4	Under-grad 96	Non-major 60
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	25	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			

I	0	Other	72
?	3		

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 237
 Questionnaires: 96

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 209
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	18	37	38	4.22	1004/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	3	20	34	34	4.09	1090/1674	4.09	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	5	14	44	29	4.02	1004/1423	4.02	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	51	1	3	13	13	12	3.76	1313/1609	3.76	4.10	4.22	4.27	3.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	13	10	24	24	20	3.31	1344/1585	3.31	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	69	2	2	4	8	8	3.75	1147/1535	3.75	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	15	31	46	4.30	809/1651	4.30	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	89	4.97	283/1673	4.97	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	33	1	0	1	15	38	8	3.85	1162/1656	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	1	1	5	16	38	4.46	931/1586	4.47	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	36	0	0	0	2	14	44	4.70	1035/1585	4.69	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	37	0	0	2	9	20	28	4.25	935/1582	4.20	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	2	8	20	30	4.30	915/1575	4.28	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	3	4	4	8	16	26	3.97	718/1380	4.11	4.01	3.94	4.01	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	2	5	15	22	4.22	673/1520	4.22	3.91	4.01	4.09	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	0	1	5	10	30	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	50	0	0	0	3	13	30	4.59	578/1511	4.59	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	50	11	0	1	4	13	17	4.31	332/ 994	4.31	3.92	3.94	3.96	4.31	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	95	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	95	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.60	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	95	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	95	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.10	4.20	4.18	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	95	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 30	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 36
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B 33			
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	8	C 13	General 4	Under-grad 96	Non-major 60
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	25	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			

I	0	Other	72
?	3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	18	37	38	4.22	1004/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	3	20	34	34	4.09	1090/1674	4.09	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	5	14	44	29	4.02	1004/1423	4.02	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	51	1	3	13	13	12	3.76	1313/1609	3.76	4.10	4.22	4.27	3.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	13	10	24	24	20	3.31	1344/1585	3.31	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	69	2	2	4	8	8	3.75	1147/1535	3.75	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	15	31	46	4.30	809/1651	4.30	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	89	4.97	283/1673	4.97	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	51	1	0	1	13	19	11	3.91	1124/1656	3.80	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.80	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	54	0	1	0	4	10	27	4.48	901/1586	4.47	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	57	0	0	0	2	9	28	4.67	1071/1585	4.69	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	56	0	0	2	7	14	17	4.15	1034/1582	4.20	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	2	5	14	19	4.25	958/1575	4.28	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	55	2	1	2	5	7	24	4.31	447/1380	4.11	4.01	3.94	4.01	4.11	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	2	5	15	22	4.22	673/1520	4.22	3.91	4.01	4.09	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	0	1	5	10	30	4.50	629/1515	4.50	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	50	0	0	0	3	13	30	4.59	578/1511	4.59	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	50	11	0	1	4	13	17	4.31	332/ 994	4.31	3.92	3.94	3.96	4.31	

Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	95	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	95	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.60	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	95	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	95	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.10	4.20	4.18	****	

Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	95	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	

Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	95	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 30	Required for Majors	3
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	B 33		Graduate 0
56-83	14	2.00-2.99 8	C 13	General	4
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 25	D 0		Under-grad 96
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives	3
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	72
?	3		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	2	3	12	38	93	4.47	671/1674	4.47	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	2	6	26	50	63	4.13	1060/1674	4.13	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	4	20	37	40	47	3.72	1188/1423	3.72	4.01	4.27	4.27	3.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	120	6	3	5	7	7	3.21	****/1609	****	4.10	4.22	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	6	26	24	35	30	26	3.04	1433/1585	3.04	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	121	6	5	5	4	6	2.96	****/1535	****	3.97	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	2	4	10	16	50	64	4.11	1020/1651	4.11	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	1	0	0	0	1	144	4.99	71/1673	4.99	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.99	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	2	1	3	18	62	38	4.09	900/1656	4.09	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	5	22	118	4.78	453/1586	4.78	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	0	3	25	117	4.76	896/1585	4.76	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	3	3	15	52	72	4.29	903/1582	4.29	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	6	33	104	4.62	551/1575	4.62	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	60	7	8	23	24	22	3.55	1020/1380	3.55	4.01	3.94	4.01	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	105	0	8	5	12	14	11	3.30	1266/1520	3.30	3.91	4.01	4.09	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	105	0	4	1	14	15	16	3.76	1203/1515	3.76	4.18	4.24	4.32	3.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	104	0	5	2	7	15	22	3.92	1121/1511	3.92	4.04	4.27	4.34	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	103	44	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	****/ 994	****	3.92	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	151	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 265	****	4.36	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	152	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	152	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 260	****	4.60	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	152	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	152	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 233	****	4.10	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	152	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	153	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	153	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	153	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	153	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	153	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	153	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	153	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	153	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	153	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	153	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	153	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	153	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	153	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302 0101
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI
 Instructor: GETHMANN, RICHA
 Enrollment: 360
 Questionnaires: 155

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 211
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 2	A 38	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 77
28-55	27	1.00-1.99 0	B 52		
56-83	41	2.00-2.99 8	C 29	General 4	Under-grad 154 Non-major 78
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 29	D 3		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 40	F 1	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other 129		
			? 14		

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 212
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	655/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	4	4.12	1068/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	1016/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1018/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	769/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	558/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	7	5	3.76	1317/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	1030/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	4	8	2	3.86	1162/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	7	6	4.00	1300/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	1024/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	5	8	1	3.29	1465/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	7	7	4.06	1119/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	603/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	397/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	629/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	602/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	93/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	166/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.19	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	137/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	108/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	145/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	4.06	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

I	0	Other	16
?	1		

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 213
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	655/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	4	4.12	1068/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	5	4.00	1016/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1018/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	3	3	7	4.00	769/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	558/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	7	5	3.76	1317/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	1030/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	588/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	738/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	1002/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	557/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	692/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	866/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	397/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	629/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	602/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	93/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	166/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.19	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	137/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	108/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.56	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	145/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	4.06	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 6	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 8	Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Major 6
				P 0	Non-major 6

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	16
?	1		

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0202
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 214
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	768/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	6	4.10	1077/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	894/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	786/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	3	9	3	4.00	769/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	7	6	3.89	1030/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	6	7	3.95	1162/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	1040/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	1056/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	805/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	874/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	5	6	5	3.78	1290/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	1184/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	392/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	4.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	9	2	3.75	1027/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	720/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	962/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.19	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	732/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	109/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	2	0	8	10	4.30	137/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.30	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	119/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	130/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	1	2	9	7	4.00	150/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0202
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 214
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0203
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 215
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	671/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	931/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	861/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	455/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1199/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	528/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1050/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	944/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	655/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	1024/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1035/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1129/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	8	3	3.92	1200/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	770/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1059/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1233/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1396/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	390/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	59/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	183/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.08	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	163/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.38	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	58/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.77	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	119/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	4.23	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0203
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 216
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	671/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	931/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	861/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	455/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1199/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	528/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	6	4.08	1050/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	944/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	655/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	618/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	394/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	635/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1036/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1059/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1233/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1396/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	390/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	59/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	183/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.08	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	163/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.38	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	58/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.77	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	119/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	4.23	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0204
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 217
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	6	11	23	4.43	735/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	7	11	22	4.38	776/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	5	14	19	4.25	845/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	8	14	18	4.25	852/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	3	0	14	8	8	3.55	1199/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	8	14	18	4.25	667/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	6	11	9	10	3.38	1493/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	28	12	4.30	1383/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	6	10	17	4.33	615/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	11	27	4.63	723/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	7	31	4.72	981/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	14	15	11	3.92	1199/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	8	13	19	4.28	940/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	2	7	13	14	4.08	630/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	7	7	8	4.05	796/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	4.05	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	7	5	10	4.14	976/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	6	5	9	4.15	983/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	6	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	657/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	3.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	4	11	21	4.47	101/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.47	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	2	3	10	21	4.39	120/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.39	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	2	0	0	3	10	21	4.53	133/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.53	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	3	7	26	4.64	96/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	4	5	17	10	3.92	167/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	3.92	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0204
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 217
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	30
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	42	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0301
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 218
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	735/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	980/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	986/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	839/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	5	7	3.94	851/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	2	12	4.37	548/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	5	6	7	3.95	1175/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	814/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	588/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	858/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	981/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	798/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	886/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	514/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	373/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	513/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	696/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	773/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	81/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	86/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	97/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	0	0	2	12	4.38	135/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	173/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	3.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	Graduate 1
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 2	Major 13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	General 0
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Under-grad 19
				P 0	Non-major 7
					Electives 1
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	18
?	1		

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0301
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 219
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	735/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	10	4.21	980/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	7	7	4.05	986/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	839/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	5	7	3.94	851/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	2	12	4.37	548/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	5	6	7	3.95	1175/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	814/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	1252/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	1004/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	1309/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	1052/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	1115/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	622/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	373/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	513/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	696/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	773/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	81/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.56	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	86/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	97/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	2	0	0	2	12	4.38	135/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.38	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	173/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	3.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	Graduate 1
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 2	Major 13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	General 0
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Under-grad 19
				P 0	Non-major 7
					Electives 1
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	18
?	1		

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0302
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 220
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	9	4.13	1085/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	8	6	3.70	1406/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	10	7	3.91	1097/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	12	5	3.86	1248/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	4	7	5	3.78	1032/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	6	10	4.24	691/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	7	8	6	3.86	1252/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	778/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	10	5	4.00	955/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	10	10	4.22	1176/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30	1374/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	3	8	8	3.87	1239/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	2	8	7	3.64	1339/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	2	1	7	9	4.05	644/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	0	5	4	3.75	1027/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	746/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	8	3	4.08	1024/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	954/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	2.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	2	0	7	7	4.00	178/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	2	1	7	7	4.12	180/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.12	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	92/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	119/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.47	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	0	3	7	5	3.76	187/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	3.76	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 1		

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0302
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 221
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	9	9	4.13	1085/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	8	6	3.70	1406/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	10	7	3.91	1097/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	2	12	5	3.86	1248/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	4	7	5	3.78	1032/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	6	10	4.24	691/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	7	8	6	3.86	1252/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	778/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	588/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	858/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	1309/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	903/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	1115/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	10	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	2	0	5	4	3.75	1027/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	746/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	8	3	4.08	1024/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	6	2	0	2	2	0	2.67	954/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	2.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	2	0	7	7	4.00	178/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	2	1	7	7	4.12	180/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.12	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	92/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	119/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.47	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	0	3	7	5	3.76	187/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	3.76	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 1		

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0401
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 222
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	1075/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	1271/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	5	8	3.90	1107/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	812/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	851/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	481/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	1070/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	706/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	4	8	5	3.84	1169/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	738/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	896/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	3	4	11	4.00	1129/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	5	11	4.00	1138/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	2	3	11	4.05	644/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	4.03	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	0	7	4	3.71	1059/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	568/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	798/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	408/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	4	2	9	4.19	157/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.19	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	150/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	47/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	159/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	99/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0401
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 222
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0401
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 223
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	1075/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	1271/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	5	8	3.90	1107/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	812/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	851/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	481/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	1070/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	706/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	4	10	0	3.60	1330/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	6	4	5	3.65	1448/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	1406/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	3	2	7	5	3.82	1261/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	1	2	4	7	3.65	1336/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	666/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	4.03	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	0	7	4	3.71	1059/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	568/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	798/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	408/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	4	2	9	4.19	157/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.19	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	150/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	47/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	159/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	99/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0401
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 223
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0402
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 224
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	10	9	4.13	1095/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	9	7	3.92	1258/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	8	11	5	3.88	1121/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	9	9	4.00	1094/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	612/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	5	8	8	3.91	1006/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	3	15	4.33	768/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	901/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	5	9	5	3.90	1124/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	5	17	4.58	774/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	20	4.75	917/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	8	5	9	3.88	1233/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	9	10	4.13	1080/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	5	8	8	4.05	648/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1010/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	881/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	751/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	****/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	10	9	4.18	157/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	0	5	14	4.48	95/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.48	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	1	1	18	4.71	89/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	0	9	10	4.29	152/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.29	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	3	2	4	12	4.19	124/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	4.19	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0402
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 224
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	5						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0402
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 225
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	10	9	4.13	1095/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	9	7	3.92	1258/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	8	11	5	3.88	1121/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	9	9	4.00	1094/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	612/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	5	8	8	3.91	1006/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	3	15	4.33	768/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	901/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	1230/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1349/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	1392/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	2	2	1	4	6	3.67	1348/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	3	1	4	5	3.47	1381/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	7	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1108/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1010/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	881/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	751/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	****/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	10	9	4.18	157/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	0	5	14	4.48	95/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.48	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	1	1	18	4.71	89/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	0	9	10	4.29	152/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.29	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	3	2	4	12	4.19	124/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	4.19	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0402
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 225
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	5						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0501
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 226
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	3	4	10	3.90	1322/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	1	12	4.10	1077/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	9	3.90	1107/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	3	12	4.32	771/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	3	2	3	5	3.57	1181/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	6	7	3.84	1074/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	3	11	4.15	977/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	1082/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	2	8	4.13	871/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	1004/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	3.98	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	1	16	4.65	1083/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	6	3	9	3.95	1173/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	6	9	4.00	1138/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	348/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	810/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	944/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	845/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	676/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	0	1	5	9	4.12	170/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.12	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	139/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	122/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.59	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	139/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.35	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	6	0	9	3.88	172/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	3.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0501
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 226
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0501
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 227
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	0	3	4	10	3.90	1322/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	1	12	4.10	1077/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	9	3.90	1107/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	3	12	4.32	771/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	3	2	3	5	3.57	1181/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	4	6	7	3.84	1074/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	3	11	4.15	977/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	1082/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	6	4	3	3.53	1362/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	3	3	4	5	3.56	1468/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	3.98	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	2	1	1	5	7	3.88	1511/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	3	3	4	4	3.31	1461/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	1	5	4	4	3.44	1391/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	3.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	1	5	1	1	3.25	1160/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	810/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	944/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	845/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	676/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	0	1	5	9	4.12	170/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.12	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	139/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.29	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	122/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.59	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	139/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.35	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	1	1	6	0	9	3.88	172/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	3.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0501
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 227
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0502
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 228
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	1	5	7	3.94	1284/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1411/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	936/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	1185/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	1	7	3	3.69	1100/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	1125/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	1009/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	887/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	955/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	723/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	1175/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	4	7	4.13	1052/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	819/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	930/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1141/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	568/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	990/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	847/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	204/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	3.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	3	3	1	6	3.77	222/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	3.77	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	94/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	202/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	3.92	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	2	4	1	4	3.23	218/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	3.23	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0502
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 228
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0502
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 229
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	1	5	7	3.94	1284/1674	4.22	4.23	4.27	4.26	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1411/1674	4.01	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	936/1423	4.03	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	1185/1609	4.18	4.10	4.22	4.27	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	1	7	3	3.69	1100/1585	3.83	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	3	5	4	3.79	1125/1535	4.15	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	1009/1651	4.00	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	887/1673	4.76	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	6	4	0	3.27	1466/1656	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1480/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1354/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	2	6	0	3.56	1388/1582	3.96	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1388/1575	3.99	4.07	4.27	4.25	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	666/1380	3.95	4.01	3.94	4.01	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1141/1520	3.94	3.91	4.01	4.09	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	568/1515	4.35	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	990/1511	4.18	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	847/ 994	3.56	3.92	3.94	3.96	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	204/ 265	4.28	4.36	4.23	4.26	3.85	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	3	3	1	6	3.77	222/ 278	4.22	4.34	4.19	4.24	3.77	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	94/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	202/ 259	4.39	4.42	4.33	4.33	3.92	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	2	2	4	1	4	3.23	218/ 233	3.95	4.10	4.20	4.18	3.23	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0502
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 229
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY
 Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 137
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 230
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	3	16	19	31	4.13	1085/1674	4.13	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	4	22	18	25	3.93	1246/1674	3.93	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	7	18	21	20	3.70	1197/1423	3.70	4.01	4.27	4.27	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	55	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	****/1609	****	4.10	4.22	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	7	6	13	20	22	3.65	1135/1585	3.65	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	60	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	****/1535	****	3.97	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	7	15	13	32	3.96	1162/1651	3.96	4.11	4.18	4.16	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	68	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	2	5	29	18	6	3.35	1438/1656	3.66	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	5	19	44	4.54	826/1586	4.57	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	3	23	41	4.49	1233/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	6	16	22	22	3.82	1261/1582	3.99	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	5	2	12	22	26	3.93	1200/1575	4.06	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	5	2	11	15	30	4.00	666/1380	3.99	4.01	3.94	4.01	3.99	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	8	3	9	8	5	2.97	1377/1520	2.97	3.91	4.01	4.09	2.97	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	5	4	10	4	10	3.30	1370/1515	3.30	4.18	4.24	4.32	3.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	5	3	10	4	10	3.34	1348/1511	3.34	4.04	4.27	4.34	3.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	40	26	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 994	****	3.92	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	69	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.36	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	70	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.60	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	71	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.10	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	71	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	71	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	71	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	71	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY
 Instructor: CRAIG, NESSLY C (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 137
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 230
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	36
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	23	2.00-2.99	5	C	15	General	1	Under-grad	71	Non-major	36
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	17	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	61				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	3	16	19	31	4.13	1085/1674	4.13	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	4	22	18	25	3.93	1246/1674	3.93	4.08	4.23	4.21	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	7	18	21	20	3.70	1197/1423	3.70	4.01	4.27	4.27	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	55	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	****/1609	****	4.10	4.22	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	7	6	13	20	22	3.65	1135/1585	3.65	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	60	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	****/1535	****	3.97	4.08	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	7	15	13	32	3.96	1162/1651	3.96	4.11	4.18	4.16	3.96	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	68	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	2	12	30	14	3.97	1022/1656	3.66	3.87	4.07	4.07	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	5	15	43	4.60	753/1586	4.57	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	3	17	42	4.59	1158/1585	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	2	11	24	25	4.16	1025/1582	3.99	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.99	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	11	22	28	4.19	1010/1575	4.06	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	10	3	3	9	15	23	3.98	692/1380	3.99	4.01	3.94	4.01	3.99	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	8	3	9	8	5	2.97	1377/1520	2.97	3.91	4.01	4.09	2.97	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	5	4	10	4	10	3.30	1370/1515	3.30	4.18	4.24	4.32	3.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	5	3	10	4	10	3.34	1348/1511	3.34	4.04	4.27	4.34	3.34	
4. Were special techniques successful	40	26	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 994	****	3.92	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	69	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 265	****	4.36	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	70	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 260	****	4.60	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	71	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.10	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	71	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	71	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	71	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	71	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101

Title CELL BIOLOGY

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 137

Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 231

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	36
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	23	2.00-2.99	5	C	15	General	1	Under-grad	71	Non-major	36
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	17	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	61				
				?	5						

Course-Section: BIOL 304 0101
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY
 Instructor: MILLER, STEPHEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 183
 Questionnaires: 119

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 232
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	7	10	40	57	4.23	979/1674	4.23	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	24	34	54	4.17	1018/1674	4.17	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	6	17	35	56	4.15	922/1423	4.15	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	27	2	6	21	29	32	3.92	1198/1609	3.92	4.10	4.22	4.27	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	24	16	27	20	23	3.02	1438/1585	3.02	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.02	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	53	4	8	13	17	22	3.70	1185/1535	3.70	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	6	24	31	55	4.14	998/1651	4.14	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	112	4.96	353/1673	4.96	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	2	1	5	27	40	25	3.85	1169/1656	4.03	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	9	21	85	4.62	738/1586	4.71	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	6	21	89	4.69	1035/1585	4.76	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	10	22	36	46	4.01	1129/1582	4.30	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	7	30	74	4.44	768/1575	4.55	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	2	3	10	25	66	4.42	371/1380	4.37	4.01	3.94	4.01	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	3	17	36	35	4.06	790/1520	4.06	3.91	4.01	4.09	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	1	6	17	69	4.66	493/1515	4.66	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	7	23	62	4.60	570/1511	4.60	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	13	2	4	16	28	30	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.92	3.94	3.96	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	117	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.36	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.60	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.10	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 304 0101
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY
 Instructor: MILLER, STEPHEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 183
 Questionnaires: 119

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 232
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	42	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	102
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	40						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	6	C	19	General	1	Under-grad	119	Non-major	17
84-150	46	3.00-3.49	29	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	28	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	101				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	7	10	40	57	4.23	979/1674	4.23	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	2	24	34	54	4.17	1018/1674	4.17	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	6	17	35	56	4.15	922/1423	4.15	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	27	2	6	21	29	32	3.92	1198/1609	3.92	4.10	4.22	4.27	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	24	16	27	20	23	3.02	1438/1585	3.02	3.91	3.96	3.95	3.02	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	53	4	8	13	17	22	3.70	1185/1535	3.70	3.97	4.08	4.15	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	6	24	31	55	4.14	998/1651	4.14	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	112	4.96	353/1673	4.96	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	41	1	0	2	10	35	30	4.21	783/1656	4.03	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	1	1	12	77	4.81	371/1586	4.71	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	0	3	10	78	4.82	762/1585	4.76	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	0	2	5	21	62	4.59	546/1582	4.30	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	2	21	66	4.65	523/1575	4.55	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	29	9	3	2	8	20	48	4.33	426/1380	4.37	4.01	3.94	4.01	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	3	17	36	35	4.06	790/1520	4.06	3.91	4.01	4.09	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	1	6	17	69	4.66	493/1515	4.66	4.18	4.24	4.32	4.66	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	7	23	62	4.60	570/1511	4.60	4.04	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	13	2	4	16	28	30	4.00	474/ 994	4.00	3.92	3.94	3.96	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	117	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.36	4.23	4.26	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.24	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.60	4.46	4.49	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	4.42	4.33	4.33	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.10	4.20	4.18	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.03	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	3.70	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	3.87	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	3.67	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	3.27	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	3.20	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	3.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	3.82	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	3.29	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	118	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.29	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 304 0101

Title PLANT BIOLOGY

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 183

Questionnaires: 119

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Fall 2005

Page 233

JAN 21, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	42	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	102
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	40						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	6	C	19	General	1	Under-grad	119	Non-major	17
84-150	46	3.00-3.49	29	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	28	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	101				
				?	7						

Course-Section: BIOL 304L 0201
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY LAB
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 234
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	1	0	4	16	33	4.48	639/1674	4.48	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	1	3	12	38	4.61	446/1674	4.61	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	3	9	14	28	4.24	853/1423	4.24	4.01	4.27	4.27	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	1	0	4	13	36	4.54	455/1609	4.54	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	3	0	1	10	15	25	4.25	557/1585	4.25	3.91	3.96	3.95	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	1	1	1	8	12	31	4.34	578/1535	4.34	3.97	4.08	4.15	4.34	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	2	3	12	37	4.56	458/1651	4.56	4.11	4.18	4.16	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	1	4	49	4.89	742/1673	4.89	4.87	4.69	4.68	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	4	18	30	4.50	381/1656	4.50	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	8	43	4.84	319/1586	4.84	4.38	4.43	4.42	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	1	2	9	38	4.68	1059/1585	4.68	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	1	6	42	4.78	272/1582	4.78	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	7	41	4.78	311/1575	4.78	4.07	4.27	4.25	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	11	1	1	11	8	18	4.05	644/1380	4.05	4.01	3.94	4.01	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	****/1520	****	3.91	4.01	4.09	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	49	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	****/1515	****	4.18	4.24	4.32	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	49	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	****/1511	****	4.04	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	49	5	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	****/ 994	****	3.92	3.94	3.96	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	1	12	20	4.58	79/ 265	4.58	4.36	4.23	4.26	4.58	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	34/ 278	4.82	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.82	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	60/ 260	4.82	4.60	4.46	4.49	4.82	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	62/ 259	4.76	4.42	4.33	4.33	4.76	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	2	1	8	22	4.52	70/ 233	4.52	4.10	4.20	4.18	4.52	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.10	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	3.91	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.29	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	61	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	3.48	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 51
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 23			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 62	Non-major 11
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	10	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 41		
				? 3			

Course-Section: BIOL 396 0101
 Title UGRAD TCHNG ASSISTANTS
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 235
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.26	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.08	4.23	4.21	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1609	****	4.10	4.22	4.27	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1651	****	4.11	4.18	4.16	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	257/1656	4.67	3.87	4.07	4.07	4.67

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.38	4.43	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.09	4.26	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.07	4.27	4.25	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.01	3.94	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 397W 0101
 Title SCIENTIFIC WRITING
 Instructor: PORTER, JANE P.
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 236
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.26	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.08	4.23	4.21	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.10	4.22	4.27	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1585	4.50	3.91	3.96	3.95	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1535	5.00	3.97	4.08	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	3.87	4.07	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.38	4.43	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.66	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.09	4.26	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.07	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.01	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	3.91	4.01	4.09	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.18	4.24	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.04	4.27	4.34	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 420 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS:CELL BIOLOG
 Instructor: MCGRAW, PATRICI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 237
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1424/1674	3.71	4.23	4.27	4.42	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1131/1423	3.86	4.01	4.27	4.34	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1198/1609	3.93	4.10	4.22	4.30	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	652/1585	4.15	3.91	3.96	4.01	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1066/1535	3.86	3.97	4.08	4.18	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	3	4	3.36	1499/1651	3.36	4.11	4.18	4.23	3.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	13	1	0	3.07	1662/1673	3.07	4.87	4.69	4.67	3.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	4	4	1	3.17	1506/1656	3.17	3.87	4.07	4.19	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	4	5	0	2.86	1557/1586	2.86	4.38	4.43	4.46	2.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1166/1585	4.57	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	7	6	1	3.57	1381/1582	3.57	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	5	1	3.21	1455/1575	3.21	4.07	4.27	4.35	3.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.01	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1353/1520	3.00	3.91	4.01	4.18	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	944/1515	4.20	4.18	4.24	4.40	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1511	4.40	4.04	4.27	4.45	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 994	****	3.92	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course-Section: BIOL 425 0101
 Title IMMUNOLOGY
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, SUZA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 238
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	287/1674	4.77	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	1035/1674	4.15	4.08	4.23	4.31	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	3	3	3.62	1243/1423	3.62	4.01	4.27	4.34	3.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	879/1609	4.23	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	715/1585	4.08	3.91	3.96	4.01	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	578/1535	4.33	3.97	4.08	4.18	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.11	4.18	4.23	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1148/1673	4.58	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	719/1656	4.25	3.87	4.07	4.19	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	618/1586	4.69	4.38	4.43	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	453/1585	4.92	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	510/1582	4.62	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.07	4.27	4.35	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	284/1380	4.54	4.01	3.94	4.04	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1520	4.71	3.91	4.01	4.18	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.18	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	729/1511	4.43	4.04	4.27	4.45	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	115/ 994	4.75	3.92	3.94	4.19	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	5
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 426 0101
 Title APPR TO MOLECULAR BIOL
 Instructor: ONEILL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 239
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	11	0	0	2	5	7	13	4.15	1075/1674	4.15	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	2	6	6	4	9	3.44	1523/1674	3.44	4.08	4.23	4.31	3.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	1	4	7	6	3	6	3.00	1363/1423	3.00	4.01	4.27	4.34	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	6	2	2	5	6	6	3.57	1423/1609	3.57	4.10	4.22	4.30	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	7	8	10	3.96	824/1585	3.96	3.91	3.96	4.01	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	14	2	2	0	5	4	3.54	1278/1535	3.54	3.97	4.08	4.18	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	0	2	14	11	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.11	4.18	4.23	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	2	0	6	13	3	3.63	1319/1656	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.19	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	6	4	6	9	3.72	1424/1586	3.72	4.38	4.43	4.46	3.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	4	9	14	4.37	1328/1585	4.37	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	3	5	12	2	4	2.96	1514/1582	2.96	4.09	4.26	4.31	2.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	4	7	10	4	3.37	1411/1575	3.37	4.07	4.27	4.35	3.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	21	3	1	2	0	0	1.83	****/1380	****	4.01	3.94	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	2	2	4	16	4.42	500/1520	4.42	3.91	4.01	4.18	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	325/1515	4.80	4.18	4.24	4.40	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	4	3	1	17	4.24	917/1511	4.24	4.04	4.27	4.45	4.24	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	23	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 994	****	3.92	3.94	4.19	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 265	****	4.36	4.23	4.53	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.21	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.60	4.46	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 17	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 4	Under-grad 21	Non-major 28
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	17	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 20		
				? 5			

Course-Section: BIOL 430 0101
 Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: WEBER, CARL S
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 240
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	521/1674	4.58	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	9	13	4.27	919/1674	4.27	4.08	4.23	4.31	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	7	11	4.04	998/1423	4.04	4.01	4.27	4.34	4.04	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	614/1609	4.43	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	4	6	11	4.23	584/1585	4.23	3.91	3.96	4.01	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1535	****	3.97	4.08	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	8	4	12	4.08	1044/1651	4.08	4.11	4.18	4.23	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	283/1673	4.96	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	0	11	11	4.35	601/1656	4.35	3.87	4.07	4.19	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	319/1586	4.85	4.38	4.43	4.46	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	227/1585	4.96	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	6	14	4.27	924/1582	4.27	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	0	2	21	4.58	612/1575	4.58	4.07	4.27	4.35	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	1	0	1	1	13	4.56	265/1380	4.56	4.01	3.94	4.04	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1520	****	3.91	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1515	****	4.18	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1511	****	4.04	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.92	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 2	A 13	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 3	Under-grad 27 Non-major 8
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 23	
			? 1		

Course-Section: BIOL 442 0101
 Title DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, DAPHN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 215
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 241
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	4	0	18	23	27	3.96	1259/1674	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.42	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	5	24	24	16	3.63	1441/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.31	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	3	12	24	19	13	3.38	1304/1423	3.38	4.01	4.27	4.34	3.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	59	0	1	5	5	0	3.36	****/1609	****	4.10	4.22	4.30	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	9	8	31	10	8	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.91	3.96	4.01	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	59	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	****/1535	****	3.97	4.08	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	6	6	18	15	25	3.67	1372/1651	3.67	4.11	4.18	4.23	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	71	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	6	27	23	7	3.45	1399/1656	3.62	3.87	4.07	4.19	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	14	20	36	4.24	1160/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.46	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	6	16	48	4.51	1216/1585	4.56	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	8	18	24	19	3.67	1348/1582	3.84	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	5	12	21	31	4.04	1122/1575	4.13	4.07	4.27	4.35	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	2	3	11	15	31	4.13	603/1380	4.16	4.01	3.94	4.04	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	57	0	4	2	2	6	4	3.22	****/1520	****	3.91	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	57	0	3	3	3	2	7	3.39	****/1515	****	4.18	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	58	0	2	1	1	6	7	3.88	****/1511	****	4.04	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	57	16	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.92	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 19		Graduate 2
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 7	C 16	General	1
84-150	33	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		Under-grad 73
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	54
			? 5		

Course-Section: BIOL 442 0101
 Title DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 215
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 242
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	4	0	18	23	27	3.96	1259/1674	3.96	4.23	4.27	4.42	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	5	24	24	16	3.63	1441/1674	3.63	4.08	4.23	4.31	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	3	12	24	19	13	3.38	1304/1423	3.38	4.01	4.27	4.34	3.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	59	0	1	5	5	0	3.36	****/1609	****	4.10	4.22	4.30	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	9	8	31	10	8	3.00	1440/1585	3.00	3.91	3.96	4.01	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	59	0	0	6	2	1	3.44	****/1535	****	3.97	4.08	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	6	6	18	15	25	3.67	1372/1651	3.67	4.11	4.18	4.23	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	71	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	1	21	30	10	3.79	1207/1656	3.62	3.87	4.07	4.19	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	8	23	37	4.36	1054/1586	4.30	4.38	4.43	4.46	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	8	12	50	4.60	1142/1585	4.56	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	3	16	24	26	4.01	1124/1582	3.84	4.09	4.26	4.31	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	10	23	33	4.22	992/1575	4.13	4.07	4.27	4.35	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	1	3	11	14	31	4.18	549/1380	4.16	4.01	3.94	4.04	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	57	0	4	2	2	6	4	3.22	****/1520	****	3.91	4.01	4.18	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	57	0	3	3	3	2	7	3.39	****/1515	****	4.18	4.24	4.40	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	58	0	2	1	1	6	7	3.88	****/1511	****	4.04	4.27	4.45	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	57	16	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 994	****	3.92	3.94	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 2 Major 49
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 19		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 7	C 16	General 1	Under-grad 73 Non-major 26
84-150	33	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 54	
			? 5		

Course-Section: BIOL 445 0101
 Title SIGNAL TRANSDUCTION
 Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYLL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 243
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	176/1674	4.88	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	776/1674	4.38	4.08	4.23	4.31	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	929/1423	4.14	4.01	4.27	4.34	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	852/1609	4.25	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1585	4.88	3.91	3.96	4.01	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	373/1535	4.50	3.97	4.08	4.18	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	866/1651	4.25	4.11	4.18	4.23	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	760/1673	4.88	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	955/1656	4.00	3.87	4.07	4.19	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1300/1586	4.00	4.38	4.43	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	640/1585	4.88	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1061/1582	4.13	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1080/1575	4.13	4.07	4.27	4.35	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	666/1380	4.00	4.01	3.94	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	3.91	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.18	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	414/1511	4.75	4.04	4.27	4.45	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	115/ 994	4.75	3.92	3.94	4.19	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 451 0101
 Title NEUROBIOLOGY
 Instructor: VIANCOUR, TERRY
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 244
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	214/1674	4.83	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	830/1674	4.33	4.08	4.23	4.31	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	262/1423	4.75	4.01	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	282/1609	4.70	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	77/1585	4.92	3.91	3.96	4.01	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	238/1535	4.67	3.97	4.08	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	1	7	4.08	1044/1651	4.08	4.11	4.18	4.23	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	257/1656	4.67	3.87	4.07	4.19	4.67	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	1144/1586	4.25	4.38	4.43	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	510/1585	4.92	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	1089/1582	4.08	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	9	4.33	886/1575	4.33	4.07	4.27	4.35	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	472/1380	4.27	4.01	3.94	4.04	4.27	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	1210/1520	3.43	3.91	4.01	4.18	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	568/1515	4.57	4.18	4.24	4.40	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	729/1511	4.43	4.04	4.27	4.45	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	600/ 994	3.83	3.92	3.94	4.19	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	7
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES
 Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 245
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	10	12	4.28	894/1674	4.28	4.08	4.23	4.31	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	1088/1423	3.92	4.01	4.27	4.34	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	11	4.16	963/1609	4.16	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	10	11	4.12	682/1585	4.12	3.91	3.96	4.01	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	9	12	4.25	667/1535	4.25	3.97	4.08	4.18	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	7	13	4.32	781/1651	4.32	4.11	4.18	4.23	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	4.60	1135/1673	4.60	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	10	7	4.14	849/1656	4.18	3.87	4.07	4.19	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	753/1586	4.65	4.38	4.43	4.46	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	615/1585	4.93	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	11	10	4.20	998/1582	4.36	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	19	4.68	481/1575	4.70	4.07	4.27	4.35	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	10	13	4.57	265/1380	4.55	4.01	3.94	4.04	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	635/1520	4.26	3.91	4.01	4.18	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	218/1515	4.89	4.18	4.24	4.40	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	380/1511	4.79	4.04	4.27	4.45	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	178/ 994	4.58	3.92	3.94	4.19	4.58	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	109/ 265	4.44	4.36	4.23	4.53	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	170/ 278	4.17	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	150/ 260	4.44	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	72/ 259	4.72	4.42	4.33	4.31	4.72	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	108/ 233	4.33	4.10	4.20	4.10	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES
 Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 245
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	3	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	9	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES
 Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 246
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	10	12	4.28	894/1674	4.28	4.08	4.23	4.31	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	1088/1423	3.92	4.01	4.27	4.34	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	11	4.16	963/1609	4.16	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	10	11	4.12	682/1585	4.12	3.91	3.96	4.01	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	9	12	4.25	667/1535	4.25	3.97	4.08	4.18	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	7	13	4.32	781/1651	4.32	4.11	4.18	4.23	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	4.60	1135/1673	4.60	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	11	8	4.17	816/1656	4.18	3.87	4.07	4.19	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	618/1586	4.65	4.38	4.43	4.46	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	284/1585	4.93	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	567/1582	4.36	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	257/1575	4.70	4.07	4.27	4.35	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	259/1380	4.55	4.01	3.94	4.04	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	635/1520	4.26	3.91	4.01	4.18	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	218/1515	4.89	4.18	4.24	4.40	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	380/1511	4.79	4.04	4.27	4.45	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	178/ 994	4.58	3.92	3.94	4.19	4.58	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	109/ 265	4.44	4.36	4.23	4.53	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	170/ 278	4.17	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	150/ 260	4.44	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	72/ 259	4.72	4.42	4.33	4.31	4.72	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	108/ 233	4.33	4.10	4.20	4.10	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES
 Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 246
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	3	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	9	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 247
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	10	12	4.28	894/1674	4.28	4.08	4.23	4.31	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	1088/1423	3.92	4.01	4.27	4.34	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	11	4.16	963/1609	4.16	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	10	11	4.12	682/1585	4.12	3.91	3.96	4.01	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	9	12	4.25	667/1535	4.25	3.97	4.08	4.18	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	7	13	4.32	781/1651	4.32	4.11	4.18	4.23	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	4.60	1135/1673	4.60	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	12	8	4.22	770/1656	4.18	3.87	4.07	4.19	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	678/1586	4.65	4.38	4.43	4.46	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	284/1585	4.93	4.54	4.69	4.76	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	14	8	4.30	882/1582	4.36	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	579/1575	4.70	4.07	4.27	4.35	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	290/1380	4.55	4.01	3.94	4.04	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	6	10	4.26	635/1520	4.26	3.91	4.01	4.18	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	218/1515	4.89	4.18	4.24	4.40	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	380/1511	4.79	4.04	4.27	4.45	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	178/ 994	4.58	3.92	3.94	4.19	4.58	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	109/ 265	4.44	4.36	4.23	4.53	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	170/ 278	4.17	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	150/ 260	4.44	4.60	4.46	4.24	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	72/ 259	4.72	4.42	4.33	4.31	4.72	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	108/ 233	4.33	4.10	4.20	4.10	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.65	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.57	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	4.46	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	4.24	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.86	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.13	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.48	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 247
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	3	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	9	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 486 0101
 Title GENOME SCIENCE
 Instructor: BUSTOS, MAURICI
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 248
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	521/1674	4.57	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1043/1674	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.31	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	614/1609	4.43	4.10	4.22	4.30	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1084/1585	3.71	3.91	3.96	4.01	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	310/1535	4.57	3.97	4.08	4.18	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1352/1651	3.71	4.11	4.18	4.23	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1497/1673	4.14	4.87	4.69	4.67	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	827/1656	4.17	3.87	4.07	4.19	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	581/1586	4.71	4.38	4.43	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1582	4.71	4.09	4.26	4.31	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	932/1575	4.29	4.07	4.27	4.35	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	567/1380	4.17	4.01	3.94	4.04	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	338/1520	4.60	3.91	4.01	4.18	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.18	4.24	4.40	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	751/1511	4.40	4.04	4.27	4.45	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	3.92	3.94	4.19	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 625 0101
 Title IMMUNOLOGY
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, SUZA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 249
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1026/1674	4.20	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	737/1674	4.40	4.08	4.23	4.34	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	459/1423	4.60	4.01	4.27	4.28	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	645/1609	4.40	4.10	4.22	4.34	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	265/1585	4.60	3.91	3.96	4.23	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	508/1535	4.40	3.97	4.08	4.27	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	393/1651	4.60	4.11	4.18	4.32	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	185/1656	4.75	3.87	4.07	4.15	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.38	4.43	4.50	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	811/1585	4.80	4.54	4.69	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	525/1582	4.60	4.09	4.26	4.33	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	579/1575	4.60	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	998/1380	3.60	4.01	3.94	3.85	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1520	4.80	3.91	4.01	4.19	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	325/1515	4.80	4.18	4.24	4.47	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	563/1511	4.60	4.04	4.27	4.49	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	3.92	3.94	4.07	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.34	4.19	4.42	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.62	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	4.26	****	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 3 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1 Under-grad 2 Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 635L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 250
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	338/1674	4.70	4.08	4.23	4.34	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	335/1423	4.70	4.01	4.27	4.28	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	282/1609	4.70	4.10	4.22	4.34	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	0	0	5	3.88	936/1585	3.88	3.91	3.96	4.23	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	373/1535	4.50	3.97	4.08	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	231/1651	4.75	4.11	4.18	4.32	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	465/1656	4.44	3.87	4.07	4.15	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	453/1586	4.79	4.38	4.43	4.50	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	811/1585	4.61	4.54	4.69	4.79	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	578/1582	4.61	4.09	4.26	4.33	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	495/1575	4.33	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	89/1380	4.81	4.01	3.94	3.85	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	3.91	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.18	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.04	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.92	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	42/ 265	4.75	4.36	4.23	4.51	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	41/ 278	4.75	4.34	4.19	4.42	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	113/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.67	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	62/ 259	4.75	4.42	4.33	4.66	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	41/ 233	4.75	4.10	4.20	4.53	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 635L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 250
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 635L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 251
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	338/1674	4.70	4.08	4.23	4.34	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	335/1423	4.70	4.01	4.27	4.28	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	282/1609	4.70	4.10	4.22	4.34	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	0	0	5	3.88	936/1585	3.88	3.91	3.96	4.23	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	373/1535	4.50	3.97	4.08	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	231/1651	4.75	4.11	4.18	4.32	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	493/1656	4.44	3.87	4.07	4.15	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	389/1586	4.79	4.38	4.43	4.50	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	1292/1585	4.61	4.54	4.69	4.79	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	438/1582	4.61	4.09	4.26	4.33	4.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1138/1575	4.33	4.07	4.27	4.30	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1380	4.81	4.01	3.94	3.85	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	3.91	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.18	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.04	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.92	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	42/ 265	4.75	4.36	4.23	4.51	4.75	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	41/ 278	4.75	4.34	4.19	4.42	4.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	113/ 260	4.63	4.60	4.46	4.67	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	62/ 259	4.75	4.42	4.33	4.66	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	41/ 233	4.75	4.10	4.20	4.53	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.50	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.89	4.48	4.62	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.22	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 99	****	4.17	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.82	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	2.67	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.08	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 61	****	3.13	4.09	4.46	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.33	4.26	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.20	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.20	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 635L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 251
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 645 0101
 Title SIGNAL TRANSDXN
 Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYLL
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 252
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	854/1674	4.33	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	830/1674	4.33	4.08	4.23	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1423	4.67	4.01	4.27	4.28	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	743/1609	4.33	4.10	4.22	4.34	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	136/1585	4.80	3.91	3.96	4.23	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	373/1535	4.50	3.97	4.08	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1377/1651	3.67	4.11	4.18	4.32	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1330/1656	3.60	3.87	4.07	4.15	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1391/1586	3.83	4.38	4.43	4.50	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1348/1582	3.67	4.09	4.26	4.33	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	3.17	1464/1575	3.17	4.07	4.27	4.30	3.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	962/1380	3.67	4.01	3.94	3.85	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	295/1520	4.67	3.91	4.01	4.19	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.18	4.24	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	323/1511	4.83	4.04	4.27	4.49	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	89/ 994	4.83	3.92	3.94	4.07	4.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.50	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	72/ 101	4.00	3.89	4.48	4.62	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	43/ 95	4.50	4.22	4.31	4.43	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	49/ 99	4.50	4.17	4.39	4.54	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	77/ 97	3.50	3.82	4.14	4.26	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 769 0103
 Title RES SEM:EVOL & ECOLOGY
 Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 253
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	215/1674	4.80	4.08	4.23	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1423	****	4.01	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	222/1609	4.75	4.10	4.22	4.34	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	136/1585	4.80	3.91	3.96	4.23	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1535	****	3.97	4.08	4.27	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.11	4.18	4.32	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1656	5.00	3.87	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1586	****	4.38	4.43	4.50	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1585	****	4.54	4.69	4.79	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1582	****	4.09	4.26	4.33	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1575	****	4.07	4.27	4.30	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	****	4.01	3.94	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	3.91	4.01	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	384/1515	4.75	4.18	4.24	4.47	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.04	4.27	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.92	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 103	5.00	4.50	4.41	4.56	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	3.89	4.48	4.62	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 95	5.00	4.22	4.31	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 99	5.00	4.17	4.39	4.54	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	34/ 97	4.67	3.82	4.14	4.26	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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