

Course-Section: BIOL 100 1
 Title Concepts Of Biology
 Instructor: Sokolove,Philli
 Enrollment: 562
 Questionnaires: 211

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 138
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	8	7	42	68	82	4.01	1114/1509	4.18	4.34	4.31	4.18	4.01
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	7	22	51	65	60	3.73	1277/1509	4.10	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	18	25	30	62	70	3.69	1113/1287	3.99	4.08	4.30	4.24	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	55	13	12	47	40	37	3.51	1309/1459	3.80	4.02	4.22	4.11	3.51
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	7	4	13	26	55	100	4.18	665/1406	3.74	3.93	4.09	4.02	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	87	5	12	36	27	37	3.68	1101/1384	3.75	3.98	4.11	3.98	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	1	11	25	59	47	62	3.61	1263/1489	4.01	4.04	4.17	4.20	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	2	2	1	2	47	149	4.69	917/1506	4.80	4.87	4.67	4.66	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	41	4	12	17	55	67	15	3.34	1314/1463	3.72	3.92	4.09	4.02	3.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	13	29	44	116	4.27	1063/1438	4.54	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	3	4	14	39	143	4.55	1123/1421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.66	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	7	25	58	57	55	3.63	1245/1411	4.09	4.21	4.31	4.27	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	15	17	49	42	80	3.76	1188/1405	4.20	4.30	4.32	4.27	3.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	7	11	38	58	80	3.99	675/1236	4.16	4.04	4.00	3.87	3.99
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	12	10	35	51	79	3.94	832/1260	4.10	3.94	4.14	3.95	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	9	12	23	45	98	4.13	862/1255	4.21	4.27	4.33	4.15	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	5	11	35	35	101	4.16	873/1258	4.20	4.27	4.38	4.18	4.16
4. Were special techniques successful	24	10	8	16	31	42	80	3.96	479/ 873	3.93	3.96	4.03	3.89	3.96
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	203	1	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	204	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	****/ 198	****	4.51	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	205	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 184	****	4.55	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	205	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 177	****	4.58	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	205	2	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	205	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	205	2	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	205	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	205	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	205	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	205	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	205	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	205	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	205	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	205	2	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	205	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	205	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	205	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	205	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	205	1	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: BIOL 100 1
 Title Concepts Of Biology
 Instructor: Sokolove,Philli
 Enrollment: 562
 Questionnaires: 211

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 138
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100 12
 Title Concepts Of Biology
 Instructor: Lake,Reagan A
 Enrollment: 458
 Questionnaires: 157

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 139
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	21	0.00-0.99	2	A	40	Required for Majors 111	Graduate	0	Major 24
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	0	B	57				
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	27	General	Under-grad	157	Non-major 133
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	10	D	5				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives			
				P	0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				I	0	Other			
				?	2				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 17 Non-major 13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	21	19	47	41	26	3.21	1455/1509	3.21	4.34	4.31	4.18	3.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	24	19	46	36	29	3.18	1445/1509	3.18	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	14	22	41	42	34	3.39	1190/1287	3.39	4.08	4.30	4.24	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	1	21	26	32	44	29	3.22	1392/1459	3.22	4.02	4.22	4.11	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	5	16	11	28	54	39	3.60	1140/1406	3.60	3.93	4.09	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	19	21	40	41	32	3.30	1277/1384	3.30	3.98	4.11	3.98	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	2	22	18	34	31	45	3.39	1345/1489	3.39	4.04	4.17	4.20	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	2	0	0	4	12	133	4.87	662/1506	4.87	4.87	4.67	4.66	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	37	3	22	24	55	15	5	2.64	1436/1463	2.64	3.92	4.09	4.02	2.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	6	8	34	46	46	3.84	1285/1438	3.84	4.45	4.46	4.44	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	10	14	22	50	43	3.73	1380/1421	3.73	4.69	4.73	4.66	3.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	15	18	38	44	22	3.29	1326/1411	3.29	4.21	4.31	4.27	3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	8	34	13	40	28	18	2.87	1371/1405	2.87	4.30	4.32	4.27	2.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	3	24	14	47	33	17	3.04	1126/1236	3.04	4.04	4.00	3.87	3.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	101	0	15	5	13	16	11	3.05	1155/1260	3.05	3.94	4.14	3.95	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	101	0	17	5	13	13	12	2.97	1210/1255	2.97	4.27	4.33	4.15	2.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	102	0	15	5	18	13	8	2.90	1238/1258	2.90	4.27	4.38	4.18	2.90
4. Were special techniques successful	104	22	4	2	17	6	6	3.23	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	66	2	4	4	22	25	38	3.96	120/ 184	3.96	4.45	4.16	4.06	3.96
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	66	0	5	6	10	35	39	4.02	121/ 198	4.02	4.51	4.22	4.14	4.02
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	66	1	3	1	11	19	60	4.40	124/ 184	4.40	4.55	4.48	4.48	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	66	2	6	3	12	19	53	4.18	126/ 177	4.18	4.58	4.36	4.29	4.18
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	66	2	7	14	18	24	30	3.60	139/ 165	3.60	4.31	4.18	4.15	3.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	146	3	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	146	8	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	146	7	1	2	4	1	0	2.63	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	146	6	2	3	2	2	0	2.44	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	146	6	1	4	2	1	1	2.67	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	148	0	2	2	3	3	3	3.23	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	148	0	2	3	4	1	3	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	148	5	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	148	4	0	5	2	2	0	2.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	148	8	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	147	0	3	3	4	1	3	2.86	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	147	1	0	2	6	2	3	3.46	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	147	5	1	2	4	0	2	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	147	5	3	2	2	1	1	2.44	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	147	5	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 1
 Title Concepts Of Biology La
 Instructor: Claassen,Lark A
 Enrollment: 422
 Questionnaires: 161

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 141
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	A	20	Required for Majors	94	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	0	B	39						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	5	C	35	General	11	Under-grad	161	Non-major	137
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	19	D	6						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	2	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	4						

Course-Section: BIOL 106 1
 Title The Human Organism
 Instructor: Lake,Reagan A
 Enrollment: 140
 Questionnaires: 79

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 142
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	3	8	20	46	4.37	756/1509	4.37	4.34	4.31	4.18	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	18	51	4.48	574/1509	4.48	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	9	15	51	4.46	566/1287	4.46	4.08	4.30	4.24	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	33	2	1	9	7	27	4.22	814/1459	4.22	4.02	4.22	4.11	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	35	5	5	10	8	15	3.53	1166/1406	3.53	3.93	4.09	4.02	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	59	1	1	4	2	11	4.11	****/1384	****	3.98	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	10	15	51	4.51	458/1489	4.51	4.04	4.17	4.20	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	2	0	0	61	15	4.12	1340/1506	4.12	4.87	4.67	4.66	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	0	1	4	32	23	4.28	598/1463	4.28	3.92	4.09	4.02	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	8	65	4.78	413/1438	4.78	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	3	70	4.86	665/1421	4.86	4.69	4.73	4.66	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	4	11	58	4.62	482/1411	4.62	4.21	4.31	4.27	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	2	9	62	4.66	459/1405	4.66	4.30	4.32	4.27	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	1	11	9	51	4.39	373/1236	4.39	4.04	4.00	3.87	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	5	2	7	6	23	3.93	832/1260	3.93	3.94	4.14	3.95	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	2	3	7	12	19	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.27	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	1	4	6	7	25	4.19	856/1258	4.19	4.27	4.38	4.18	4.19
4. Were special techniques successful	36	29	2	2	3	1	6	3.50	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	75	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	77	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.51	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.55	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.58	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	78	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	77	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	77	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	77	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****

Course-Section: BIOL 106 1
 Title The Human Organism
 Instructor: Lake, Reagan A
 Enrollment: 140
 Questionnaires: 79

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 142
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	5	A	19	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	22	General	43	Under-grad	78	Non-major	78
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 109 1
 Title Life: Intro To Mod Bio
 Instructor: Caruso, Steven M
 Enrollment: 100
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 143
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: BIOL 109 1
 Title Life: Intro To Mod Bio
 Instructor: Caruso, Steven M
 Enrollment: 100
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 143
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 215H 1
 Title Ebiology - Phage Hunte
 Instructor: Sandoz,James W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 144
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: BIOL 215H 1
 Title Ebiology - Phage Hunte
 Instructor: Sandoz,James W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 144
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 215H 1
 Title Ebiology - Phage Hunte
 Instructor: Caruso, Steven M (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 145
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	351/1509	4.71	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	1168/1287	3.50	4.08	4.30	4.35	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	931/1459	4.07	4.02	4.22	4.30	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	739/1406	4.10	3.93	4.09	4.09	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	767/1384	4.07	3.98	4.11	4.09	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	1184/1489	3.79	4.04	4.17	4.19	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1014/1506	4.57	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	579/1463	4.34	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	588/1438	4.55	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	537/1421	4.88	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	416/1411	4.66	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.66
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	558/1405	4.58	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	248/1236	4.19	4.04	4.00	4.11	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.94	4.14	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	690/1255	4.38	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	818/1258	4.25	4.27	4.38	4.44	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	25/ 184	4.79	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	36/ 198	4.71	4.51	4.22	4.51	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	45/ 184	4.79	4.55	4.48	4.62	4.79
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	39/ 177	4.79	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.79
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	64/ 165	4.43	4.31	4.18	4.56	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 215H 1
 Title Ebiology - Phage Hunte
 Instructor: Caruso, Steven M (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 145
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 215H 1
 Title Ebiology - Phage Hunte
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 146
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: BIOL 215H 1
 Title Ebiology - Phage Hunte
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 146
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	11	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	374/1509	4.72	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	483/1509	4.48	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	2	12	4.26	771/1287	4.33	4.08	4.30	4.35	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1077/1459	4.25	4.02	4.22	4.30	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	478/1406	4.36	3.93	4.09	4.09	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	619/1384	4.11	3.98	4.11	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	5	2	10	4.05	951/1489	4.24	4.04	4.17	4.19	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	350/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	0	5	1	2	3.33	1314/1463	3.95	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	1268/1438	4.33	4.45	4.46	4.48	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	1285/1421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1051/1411	4.48	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1005/1405	4.61	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1236	4.49	4.04	4.00	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	964/1260	3.82	3.94	4.14	4.19	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	822/1255	4.12	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	792/1258	4.13	4.27	4.38	4.44	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	42/ 184	4.53	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.62
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	55/ 198	4.60	4.51	4.22	4.51	4.54
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	68/ 184	4.52	4.55	4.48	4.62	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	32/ 177	4.61	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 165	4.88	4.31	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.00	****
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 1
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 148
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	374/1509	4.72	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	483/1509	4.48	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	2	12	4.26	771/1287	4.33	4.08	4.30	4.35	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1077/1459	4.25	4.02	4.22	4.30	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	478/1406	4.36	3.93	4.09	4.09	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	619/1384	4.11	3.98	4.11	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	5	2	10	4.05	951/1489	4.24	4.04	4.17	4.19	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	350/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1125/1463	3.95	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1288/1438	4.33	4.45	4.46	4.48	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1107/1421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	810/1411	4.48	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	828/1405	4.61	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1236	4.49	4.04	4.00	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	964/1260	3.82	3.94	4.14	4.19	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	822/1255	4.12	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	792/1258	4.13	4.27	4.38	4.44	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	42/ 184	4.53	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.62
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	55/ 198	4.60	4.51	4.22	4.51	4.54
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	68/ 184	4.52	4.55	4.48	4.62	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	32/ 177	4.61	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 165	4.88	4.31	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.00	****
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 1
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 149
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	374/1509	4.72	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	483/1509	4.48	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	2	12	4.26	771/1287	4.33	4.08	4.30	4.35	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	1077/1459	4.25	4.02	4.22	4.30	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	478/1406	4.36	3.93	4.09	4.09	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	619/1384	4.11	3.98	4.11	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	5	2	10	4.05	951/1489	4.24	4.04	4.17	4.19	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	350/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1194/1463	3.95	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/1438	4.33	4.45	4.46	4.48	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/1411	4.48	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1405	4.61	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1236	4.49	4.04	4.00	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	964/1260	3.82	3.94	4.14	4.19	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	822/1255	4.12	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	792/1258	4.13	4.27	4.38	4.44	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	42/ 184	4.53	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.62
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	55/ 198	4.60	4.51	4.22	4.51	4.54
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	68/ 184	4.52	4.55	4.48	4.62	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	32/ 177	4.61	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	8	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 165	4.88	4.31	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.00	****
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 2
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab
 Instructor: Fleischmann, Est (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 150
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	386/1509	4.72	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	7	13	4.41	699/1509	4.48	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	728/1287	4.33	4.08	4.30	4.35	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	10	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	536/1459	4.25	4.02	4.22	4.30	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	656/1406	4.36	3.93	4.09	4.09	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	11	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	1017/1384	4.11	3.98	4.11	4.09	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	875/1489	4.24	4.04	4.17	4.19	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	583/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	1	2	9	1	3.77	1092/1463	3.95	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	881/1421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	303/1411	4.48	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	513/1405	4.61	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	563/1236	4.49	4.04	4.00	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1260	3.82	3.94	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1255	4.12	4.27	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1258	4.13	4.27	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	90/ 184	4.53	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	59/ 198	4.60	4.51	4.22	4.51	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	146/ 184	4.52	4.55	4.48	4.62	4.22
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	2	2	2	12	4.33	110/ 177	4.61	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	15	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 165	4.88	4.31	4.18	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	20
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 10	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	Under-grad	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
			Other		1

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 2
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 151
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	20
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 10	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	Under-grad	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			Other		1
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 2
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 152
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	386/1509	4.72	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	7	13	4.41	699/1509	4.48	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	2	7	12	4.32	728/1287	4.33	4.08	4.30	4.35	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	10	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	536/1459	4.25	4.02	4.22	4.30	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	656/1406	4.36	3.93	4.09	4.09	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	11	2	0	1	2	5	3.80	1017/1384	4.11	3.98	4.11	4.09	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	875/1489	4.24	4.04	4.17	4.19	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	583/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	325/1463	3.95	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	447/1438	4.33	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	469/1411	4.48	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	205/1405	4.61	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	176/1236	4.49	4.04	4.00	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1260	3.82	3.94	4.14	4.19	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1255	4.12	4.27	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1258	4.13	4.27	4.38	4.44	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	90/ 184	4.53	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.22
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	59/ 198	4.60	4.51	4.22	4.51	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	146/ 184	4.52	4.55	4.48	4.62	4.22
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	2	2	2	12	4.33	110/ 177	4.61	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	15	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 165	4.88	4.31	4.18	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	20
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 10	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	Under-grad	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
			Other		1

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 4
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab
 Instructor: Fleischmann, Est (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 153
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	244/1509	4.72	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	589/1509	4.48	4.09	4.26	4.32	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	590/1287	4.33	4.08	4.30	4.35	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	569/1459	4.25	4.02	4.22	4.30	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	287/1406	4.36	3.93	4.09	4.09	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	466/1384	4.11	3.98	4.11	4.09	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	276/1489	4.24	4.04	4.17	4.19	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	682/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.61	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	9	9	4.32	567/1463	3.95	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.02
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	291/1438	4.33	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	322/1421	4.67	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	496/1411	4.48	4.21	4.31	4.37	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	419/1405	4.61	4.30	4.32	4.39	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	314/1236	4.49	4.04	4.00	4.11	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	746/1260	3.82	3.94	4.14	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	904/1255	4.12	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	1025/1258	4.13	4.27	4.38	4.44	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	20/ 184	4.53	4.45	4.16	4.54	4.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	24/ 198	4.60	4.51	4.22	4.51	4.85
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	68/ 184	4.52	4.55	4.48	4.62	4.69
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	59/ 177	4.61	4.58	4.36	4.65	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	5	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	17/ 165	4.88	4.31	4.18	4.56	4.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 4
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab
 Instructor: Fleischmann, Est (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 153
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	18	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 4
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 154
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	18	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 1
 Title Ecology & Evolution
 Instructor: Omland, Kevin E (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 231
 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 155
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 301 1
 Title Ecology & Evolution
 Instructor: Mendelson, Tamra (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 231
 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 156
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	1	10	32	45	4.34	800/1509	4.34	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	10	43	33	4.22	901/1509	4.22	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	5	12	35	37	4.17	844/1287	4.17	4.08	4.30	4.33	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	38	2	1	9	19	20	4.06	945/1459	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	8	13	17	19	23	3.45	1207/1406	3.45	3.93	4.09	4.12	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	48	2	4	8	12	11	3.70	1083/1384	3.70	3.98	4.11	4.15	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	2	9	28	46	4.39	619/1489	4.39	4.04	4.17	4.14	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	2	83	4.98	175/1506	4.98	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	0	1	13	38	18	4.04	831/1463	3.91	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	5	11	61	4.73	497/1438	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	1	0	12	63	4.80	794/1421	4.88	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	1	5	19	51	4.58	532/1411	4.40	4.21	4.31	4.29	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	2	21	52	4.58	558/1405	4.57	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	1	0	1	5	20	51	4.57	229/1236	4.35	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	2	8	4	15	4.10	712/1260	4.10	3.94	4.14	4.22	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	62	0	1	2	5	7	14	4.07	886/1255	4.07	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	63	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	598/1258	4.54	4.27	4.38	4.42	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	63	10	1	2	7	5	3	3.39	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 301 1
 Title Ecology & Evolution
 Instructor: Leips,Jeffery W (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 231
 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 157
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	10	32	45	4.34	800/1509	4.34	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	10	43	33	4.22	901/1509	4.22	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	5	12	35	37	4.17	844/1287	4.17	4.08	4.30	4.33	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	38	2	1	9	19	20	4.06	945/1459	4.06	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	8	13	17	19	23	3.45	1207/1406	3.45	3.93	4.09	4.12	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	48	2	4	8	12	11	3.70	1083/1384	3.70	3.98	4.11	4.15	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	2	9	28	46	4.39	619/1489	4.39	4.04	4.17	4.14	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	2	83	4.98	175/1506	4.98	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	1	0	1	17	39	13	3.91	970/1463	3.91	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	2	16	58	4.74	480/1438	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	2	6	67	4.87	639/1421	4.88	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	1	6	25	43	4.47	665/1411	4.40	4.21	4.31	4.29	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	16	56	4.63	499/1405	4.57	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	4	0	3	3	23	45	4.49	290/1236	4.35	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	2	8	4	15	4.10	712/1260	4.10	3.94	4.14	4.22	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	62	0	1	2	5	7	14	4.07	886/1255	4.07	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	63	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	598/1258	4.54	4.27	4.38	4.42	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	63	10	1	2	7	5	3	3.39	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	11	41	63	73	4.04	1093/1509	4.04	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	20	47	62	57	3.79	1234/1509	3.79	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	27	37	72	46	3.66	1118/1287	3.66	4.08	4.30	4.33	3.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	73	2	18	31	36	29	3.62	1260/1459	3.62	4.02	4.22	4.26	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	4	8	30	48	90	4.18	674/1406	4.18	3.93	4.09	4.12	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	90	10	10	24	30	23	3.47	1204/1384	3.47	3.98	4.11	4.15	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	17	39	46	81	3.98	1022/1489	3.98	4.04	4.17	4.14	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	4	145	36	4.16	1320/1506	4.16	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	48	4	3	7	44	66	17	3.64	1187/1463	3.64	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	9	22	75	77	4.17	1135/1438	4.17	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	12	54	117	4.54	1130/1421	4.54	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	9	16	48	62	48	3.68	1232/1411	3.68	4.21	4.31	4.29	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	9	16	33	52	75	3.91	1132/1405	3.91	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	8	16	20	52	87	4.06	635/1236	4.06	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	81	0	25	16	26	23	18	2.94	1188/1260	2.94	3.94	4.14	4.22	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	81	0	15	19	22	18	34	3.34	1165/1255	3.34	4.27	4.33	4.37	3.34
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	85	0	8	11	29	27	29	3.56	1134/1258	3.56	4.27	4.38	4.42	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	82	79	6	5	9	4	4	2.82	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	184	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	187	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	4.51	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	186	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.55	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	188	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.58	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	188	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	186	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	187	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	187	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	188	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.73	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	188	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	188	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	188	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	187	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 59	Required for Majors 166	Graduate 0	Major 82
28-55	34	1.00-1.99	0	B 67			
56-83	41	2.00-2.99	9	C 34	General 0	Under-grad 189	Non-major 107
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	30	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	60	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	5			

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 2
 Title Mol & Gen Genetics Lab
 Instructor: Sandoz, James W
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 159
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors	Graduate	0	Major 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4				
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General	Under-grad	20	Non-major 6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0				
				I 0	Other			
				? 1				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	3	8	5	3.94	1174/1509	3.97	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	3	6	3.88	1176/1509	3.82	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	8	9	4.53	500/1287	4.23	4.08	4.30	4.33	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	647/1459	4.03	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	6	4	3	3.64	1116/1406	3.71	3.93	4.09	4.12	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	718/1384	3.92	3.98	4.11	4.15	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	5	7	3.88	1120/1489	3.54	4.04	4.17	4.14	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	350/1506	4.91	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	690/1463	4.14	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	839/1438	4.19	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	1146/1421	4.60	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1107/1411	3.81	4.21	4.31	4.29	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	954/1405	4.01	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	0	4	4	4	3.40	1031/1236	3.71	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1162/1260	3.58	3.94	4.14	4.22	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	904/1255	4.14	4.27	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1126/1258	3.82	4.27	4.38	4.42	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 873	3.60	3.96	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	4	1	7	4.08	104/ 184	4.00	4.45	4.16	4.07	4.08
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	156/ 198	4.07	4.51	4.22	4.17	3.85
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	93/ 184	4.48	4.55	4.48	4.52	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	99/ 177	4.26	4.58	4.36	4.30	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	140/ 165	3.79	4.31	4.18	4.11	3.54
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	0	
?	3			

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 4
 Title Mol & Gen Genetics Lab
 Instructor: Sandoz, James W
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 161
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 5
 Title Mol & Gen Genetics Lab
 Instructor: Sandoz, James W
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 162
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 6
 Title Mol & Gen Genetics Lab
 Instructor: Sandoz, James W
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 163
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	6	17	24	28	3.87	1236/1509	3.87	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	8	29	23	15	3.50	1372/1509	3.50	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	8	12	21	21	15	3.30	1213/1287	3.30	4.08	4.30	4.33	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	49	4	3	4	7	6	3.33	1367/1459	3.33	4.02	4.22	4.26	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	9	9	16	11	24	3.46	1201/1406	3.46	3.93	4.09	4.12	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	59	3	1	5	2	6	3.41	****/1384	****	3.98	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	7	9	9	17	32	3.78	1184/1489	3.78	4.04	4.17	4.14	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	3	71	4.92	466/1506	4.92	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	10	13	25	15	3	2.82	1421/1463	3.28	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	4	5	10	15	40	4.11	1173/1438	4.30	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	3	5	9	21	36	4.11	1331/1421	4.37	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	10	10	20	17	17	3.28	1328/1411	3.63	4.21	4.31	4.29	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	11	8	15	16	23	3.44	1285/1405	3.70	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	15	6	9	17	6	20	3.43	1016/1236	3.91	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	53	0	3	5	9	6	2	2.96	1177/1260	2.96	3.94	4.14	4.22	2.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	51	0	2	4	8	5	8	3.48	1132/1255	3.48	4.27	4.33	4.37	3.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	52	0	2	3	9	8	4	3.35	1182/1258	3.35	4.27	4.38	4.42	3.35
4. Were special techniques successful	51	19	3	1	2	1	1	2.50	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	77	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	4.51	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.55	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	77	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 177	****	4.58	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	77	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	77	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 62	Graduate 0 Major 41
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 26		
56-83	24	2.00-2.99 6	C 10	General 0	Under-grad 78 Non-major 37
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 13	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives 0	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	6	17	24	28	3.87	1236/1509	3.87	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	8	29	23	15	3.50	1372/1509	3.50	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	8	12	21	21	15	3.30	1213/1287	3.30	4.08	4.30	4.33	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	49	4	3	4	7	6	3.33	1367/1459	3.33	4.02	4.22	4.26	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	9	9	16	11	24	3.46	1201/1406	3.46	3.93	4.09	4.12	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	59	3	1	5	2	6	3.41	****/1384	****	3.98	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	7	9	9	17	32	3.78	1184/1489	3.78	4.04	4.17	4.14	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	3	71	4.92	466/1506	4.92	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	1	4	17	29	12	3.75	1109/1463	3.28	3.92	4.09	4.08	3.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	9	13	47	4.50	800/1438	4.30	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	0	3	16	50	4.63	1060/1421	4.37	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	4	3	15	17	31	3.97	1079/1411	3.63	4.21	4.31	4.29	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	7	15	10	35	3.96	1089/1405	3.70	4.30	4.32	4.32	3.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	3	8	16	40	4.39	373/1236	3.91	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	53	0	3	5	9	6	2	2.96	1177/1260	2.96	3.94	4.14	4.22	2.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	51	0	2	4	8	5	8	3.48	1132/1255	3.48	4.27	4.33	4.37	3.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	52	0	2	3	9	8	4	3.35	1182/1258	3.35	4.27	4.38	4.42	3.35
4. Were special techniques successful	51	19	3	1	2	1	1	2.50	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	77	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	4.51	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.55	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	77	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 177	****	4.58	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	77	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	77	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	77	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 62	Graduate 0 Major 41
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 26		
56-83	24	2.00-2.99 6	C 10	General 0	Under-grad 78 Non-major 37
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 13	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 4		

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 1
 Title Cell Biology Lab
 Instructor: Mackay, Andrew B
 Enrollment: 490
 Questionnaires: 219

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 166
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	16	0	6	9	26	88	74	4.06	1079/1509	4.06	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	53	0	2	4	18	56	86	4.33	785/1509	4.33	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	54	1	7	37	55	58	3.91	1010/1287	3.91	4.08	4.30	4.33	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	55	6	4	13	23	59	59	3.99	1000/1459	3.99	4.02	4.22	4.26	3.99
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	63	9	6	9	28	37	67	4.02	798/1406	4.02	3.93	4.09	4.12	4.02
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	61	2	9	6	36	53	52	3.85	978/1384	3.85	3.98	4.11	4.15	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	60	0	5	12	18	42	82	4.16	865/1489	4.16	4.04	4.17	4.14	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	63	0	0	0	2	22	132	4.83	722/1506	4.83	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	38	4	2	3	35	76	61	4.08	815/1463	4.08	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	78	0	0	1	9	17	114	4.73	480/1438	4.73	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	78	0	1	3	11	22	104	4.60	1091/1421	4.60	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	81	0	0	4	12	26	96	4.55	556/1411	4.55	4.21	4.31	4.29	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	80	1	4	1	20	26	87	4.38	778/1405	4.38	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	91	46	6	9	17	20	30	3.72	877/1236	3.72	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	187	0	1	0	5	5	21	4.41	****/1260	****	3.94	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	186	0	1	0	9	6	17	4.15	****/1255	****	4.27	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	186	0	1	2	7	4	19	4.15	****/1258	****	4.27	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	186	11	2	3	5	5	7	3.55	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	136	0	3	4	15	24	37	4.06	104/ 184	4.06	4.45	4.16	4.07	4.06
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	138	0	0	2	9	20	50	4.46	68/ 198	4.46	4.51	4.22	4.17	4.46
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	137	0	1	1	10	27	43	4.34	129/ 184	4.34	4.55	4.48	4.52	4.34
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	137	1	1	1	9	19	51	4.46	91/ 177	4.46	4.58	4.36	4.30	4.46
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	137	0	1	7	14	22	38	4.09	99/ 165	4.09	4.31	4.18	4.11	4.09
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	216	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	216	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	216	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	216	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	216	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	216	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	216	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	216	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	216	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	216	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	216	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	216	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	216	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	216	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	216	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 1
 Title Cell Biology Lab
 Instructor: Mackay, Andrew B
 Enrollment: 490
 Questionnaires: 219

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 166
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 59	Required for Majors 135	Graduate 0 Major 126
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 59		
56-83	16	2.00-2.99 13	C 20	General 3	Under-grad 219 Non-major 93
84-150	63	3.00-3.49 31	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 35	F 1	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 9		

1Course-Section: BIOL 304 1
 Title Plant Biology
 Instructor: Lu, Hua (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 265
 Questionnaires: 78

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 167
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	2	0	0	0	3	26	47	4.58	516/1509	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	27	43	4.47	589/1509	4.47	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	7	24	45	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.08	4.30	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	45	1	1	2	8	20	4.41	619/1459	4.41	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	18	4	2	17	13	20	3.77	1038/1406	3.77	3.93	4.09	4.12	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	52	1	0	3	8	13	4.28	589/1384	4.28	3.98	4.11	4.15	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	8	25	41	4.41	583/1489	4.41	4.04	4.17	4.14	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	1	0	1	71	4.95	350/1506	4.95	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	4	14	32	16	3.91	983/1463	4.16	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	4	10	59	4.67	588/1438	4.78	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	7	64	4.80	794/1421	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	12	16	41	4.20	936/1411	4.46	4.21	4.31	4.29	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	6	12	54	4.50	634/1405	4.64	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	6	0	1	5	17	41	4.53	255/1236	4.54	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	****/1260	****	3.94	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	66	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	****/1255	****	4.27	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	66	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	****/1258	****	4.27	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	66	6	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 304 1
 Title Plant Biology
 Instructor: Behrens,Paul W (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 265
 Questionnaires: 78

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 168
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	26	47	4.58	516/1509	4.58	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	27	43	4.47	589/1509	4.47	4.09	4.26	4.25	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	7	24	45	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.08	4.30	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	45	1	1	2	8	20	4.41	619/1459	4.41	4.02	4.22	4.26	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	18	4	2	17	13	20	3.77	1038/1406	3.77	3.93	4.09	4.12	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	52	1	0	3	8	13	4.28	589/1384	4.28	3.98	4.11	4.15	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	8	25	41	4.41	583/1489	4.41	4.04	4.17	4.14	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	1	0	1	71	4.95	350/1506	4.95	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	1	4	26	32	4.41	452/1463	4.16	3.92	4.09	4.08	4.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	6	63	4.89	247/1438	4.78	4.45	4.46	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	8	62	4.89	588/1421	4.84	4.69	4.73	4.73	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	2	12	55	4.73	339/1411	4.46	4.21	4.31	4.29	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	11	57	4.77	321/1405	4.64	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	8	0	0	5	16	36	4.54	248/1236	4.54	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	****/1260	****	3.94	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	66	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	****/1255	****	4.27	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	66	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	****/1258	****	4.27	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	66	6	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 425 1
 Title Immunology
 Instructor: Rosenberg, Suzan
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 169
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	891/1509	4.22	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	453/1287	4.57	4.08	4.30	4.38	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	553/1459	4.44	4.02	4.22	4.32	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	5	5	6	3.88	949/1406	3.88	3.93	4.09	4.11	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	649/1384	4.22	3.98	4.11	4.23	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	2	9	3.94	1058/1489	3.94	4.04	4.17	4.18	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	883/1506	4.72	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	786/1463	4.12	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	846/1421	4.78	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	5	7	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.21	4.31	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	520/1236	4.21	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1260	****	3.94	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1255	****	4.27	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	****	4.27	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	12
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 426 1
 Title Appr To Molecular Biol
 Instructor: Oneill,Michael
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 170
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: BIOL 430 1
 Title Biological Chemistry
 Instructor: Bustos,Mauricio
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 171
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 442 1
 Title Developmental Biology
 Instructor: Blumberg,Daphne (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 255
 Questionnaires: 69

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 172
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	7	21	37	4.30	833/1509	4.30	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	6	12	31	18	3.91	1156/1509	3.91	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	14	36	14	3.87	1042/1287	3.87	4.08	4.30	4.38	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	46	1	2	10	5	4	3.41	1342/1459	3.41	4.02	4.22	4.32	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	13	7	14	19	9	3.06	1324/1406	3.06	3.93	4.09	4.11	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	54	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	****/1384	****	3.98	4.11	4.23	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	6	6	11	23	18	3.64	1245/1489	3.64	4.04	4.17	4.18	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	0	1	1	63	4.95	292/1506	4.95	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	5	4	28	18	1	3.11	1381/1463	3.63	3.92	4.09	4.18	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	10	24	28	4.14	1154/1438	4.42	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	3	7	18	38	4.33	1263/1421	4.59	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	6	25	19	13	3.50	1277/1411	3.93	4.21	4.31	4.35	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	10	23	29	4.14	980/1405	4.34	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	3	8	12	19	19	3.70	883/1236	3.90	4.04	4.00	4.03	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	50	0	5	2	3	7	2	2.95	1184/1260	2.95	3.94	4.14	4.25	2.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	3	2	3	7	4	3.37	1161/1255	3.37	4.27	4.33	4.46	3.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	51	0	4	1	5	3	5	3.22	1205/1258	3.22	4.27	4.38	4.51	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	51	10	3	1	2	1	1	2.50	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	67	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.62	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	68	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors	57	Graduate	0	Major	61
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 33						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 8	C 10	General	1	Under-grad	69	Non-major	8
84-150	29	3.00-3.49 16	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 22	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	2				
			? 2						

Course-Section: BIOL 442 1
 Title Developmental Biology
 Instructor: Brewster,Rachel (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 255
 Questionnaires: 69

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 173
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	7	21	37	4.30	833/1509	4.30	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	6	12	31	18	3.91	1156/1509	3.91	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	14	36	14	3.87	1042/1287	3.87	4.08	4.30	4.38	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	46	1	2	10	5	4	3.41	1342/1459	3.41	4.02	4.22	4.32	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	13	7	14	19	9	3.06	1324/1406	3.06	3.93	4.09	4.11	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	54	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	****/1384	****	3.98	4.11	4.23	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	6	6	11	23	18	3.64	1245/1489	3.64	4.04	4.17	4.18	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	0	1	1	63	4.95	292/1506	4.95	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	1	6	33	16	4.14	750/1463	3.63	3.92	4.09	4.18	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	13	49	4.71	531/1438	4.42	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	6	58	4.85	691/1421	4.59	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	4	26	33	4.37	779/1411	3.93	4.21	4.31	4.35	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	3	18	42	4.54	605/1405	4.34	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	1	3	10	20	25	4.10	616/1236	3.90	4.04	4.00	4.03	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	50	0	5	2	3	7	2	2.95	1184/1260	2.95	3.94	4.14	4.25	2.95
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	3	2	3	7	4	3.37	1161/1255	3.37	4.27	4.33	4.46	3.37
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	51	0	4	1	5	3	5	3.22	1205/1258	3.22	4.27	4.38	4.51	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	51	10	3	1	2	1	1	2.50	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	67	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.62	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	68	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors	57
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 33		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 8	C 10	General	1
84-150	29	3.00-3.49 16	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 22	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	2
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: BIOL 444 1
 Title Development And Cancer
 Instructor: Bieberich,Charl
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 174
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	235/1509	4.81	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	141/1509	4.88	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	337/1287	4.69	4.08	4.30	4.38	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	67/1459	4.94	4.02	4.22	4.32	4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	63/1406	4.94	3.93	4.09	4.11	4.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	81/1384	4.88	3.98	4.11	4.23	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	145/1489	4.81	4.04	4.17	4.18	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	408/1506	4.94	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	81/1463	4.91	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1438	4.87	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1421	4.94	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	232/1411	4.81	4.21	4.31	4.35	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	432/1405	4.69	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	306/1236	4.46	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	370/1260	4.57	3.94	4.14	4.25	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	390/1255	4.71	4.27	4.33	4.46	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.27	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 451 1
 Title Neurobiology
 Instructor: Robinson,Phylli (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 175
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	10	6	3.86	1196/1509	3.86	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	8	4.23	803/1287	4.23	4.08	4.30	4.38	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	1088/1459	3.90	4.02	4.22	4.32	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	8	5	3.76	1038/1406	3.76	3.93	4.09	4.11	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	11	6	3.95	873/1384	3.95	3.98	4.11	4.23	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	8	5	7	3.86	1141/1489	3.86	4.04	4.17	4.18	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.87	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	7	5	3.89	998/1463	3.89	3.92	4.09	4.18	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	9	10	4.23	1094/1438	4.41	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	1049/1421	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	9	7	3.95	1098/1411	3.98	4.21	4.31	4.35	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	12	4.27	881/1405	4.23	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	520/1236	4.32	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	496/1260	4.42	3.94	4.14	4.25	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.27	4.33	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.27	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	196/ 873	4.55	3.96	4.03	4.26	4.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.51	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.55	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.58	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: BIOL 451 1
 Title Neurobiology
 Instructor: Robinson, Phylli (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 175
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	14	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	3	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	12
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 451 1
 Title Neurobiology
 Instructor: Lin, Weihong (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 176
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	10	6	3.86	1196/1509	3.86	4.09	4.26	4.26	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	8	4.23	803/1287	4.23	4.08	4.30	4.38	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	1088/1459	3.90	4.02	4.22	4.32	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	8	5	3.76	1038/1406	3.76	3.93	4.09	4.11	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	11	6	3.95	873/1384	3.95	3.98	4.11	4.23	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	8	5	7	3.86	1141/1489	3.86	4.04	4.17	4.18	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.87	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	2	2	9	4	3.88	998/1463	3.89	3.92	4.09	4.18	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	687/1438	4.41	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	639/1421	4.75	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	7	9	4.00	1051/1411	3.98	4.21	4.31	4.35	3.98
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	5	12	4.18	947/1405	4.23	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	338/1236	4.32	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	496/1260	4.42	3.94	4.14	4.25	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.27	4.33	4.46	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.27	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	196/ 873	4.55	3.96	4.03	4.26	4.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.51	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.55	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.58	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: BIOL 451 1
 Title Neurobiology
 Instructor: Lin, Weihong (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 176
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	14	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	3	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	12
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	470/1509	4.61	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	519/1509	4.53	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	414/1287	4.61	4.08	4.30	4.38	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.02	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	261/1406	4.61	3.93	4.09	4.11	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	505/1384	4.35	3.98	4.11	4.23	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	541/1489	4.44	4.04	4.17	4.18	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	350/1506	4.94	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	118/1463	4.53	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1438	4.80	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421	4.98	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	159/1411	4.61	4.21	4.31	4.35	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	194/1405	4.57	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	0	14	4.69	164/1236	4.60	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1260	4.89	3.94	4.14	4.25	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	221/1255	4.89	4.27	4.33	4.46	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	261/1258	4.89	4.27	4.38	4.51	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	105/ 873	4.78	3.96	4.03	4.26	4.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	19/ 184	4.86	4.45	4.16	4.62	4.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	4.51	4.22	4.37	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	36/ 184	4.83	4.55	4.48	4.66	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.58	4.36	4.47	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	21/ 165	4.83	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 2	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	470/1509	4.61	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	519/1509	4.53	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	414/1287	4.61	4.08	4.30	4.38	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.02	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	261/1406	4.61	3.93	4.09	4.11	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	505/1384	4.35	3.98	4.11	4.23	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	541/1489	4.44	4.04	4.17	4.18	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	350/1506	4.94	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	248/1463	4.53	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	131/1438	4.80	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	322/1421	4.98	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	211/1411	4.61	4.21	4.31	4.35	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	321/1405	4.57	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	199/1236	4.60	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1260	4.89	3.94	4.14	4.25	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	221/1255	4.89	4.27	4.33	4.46	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	261/1258	4.89	4.27	4.38	4.51	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	105/ 873	4.78	3.96	4.03	4.26	4.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	19/ 184	4.86	4.45	4.16	4.62	4.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	4.51	4.22	4.37	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	36/ 184	4.83	4.55	4.48	4.66	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.58	4.36	4.47	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	21/ 165	4.83	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 2	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	470/1509	4.61	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	519/1509	4.53	4.09	4.26	4.26	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	414/1287	4.61	4.08	4.30	4.38	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.02	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	261/1406	4.61	3.93	4.09	4.11	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	505/1384	4.35	3.98	4.11	4.23	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	541/1489	4.44	4.04	4.17	4.18	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	350/1506	4.94	4.87	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	690/1463	4.53	3.92	4.09	4.18	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	1	13	4.44	878/1438	4.80	4.45	4.46	4.50	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421	4.98	4.69	4.73	4.76	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	992/1411	4.61	4.21	4.31	4.35	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	1	10	4.06	1024/1405	4.57	4.30	4.32	4.34	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	274/1236	4.60	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1260	4.89	3.94	4.14	4.25	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	221/1255	4.89	4.27	4.33	4.46	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	261/1258	4.89	4.27	4.38	4.51	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	105/ 873	4.78	3.96	4.03	4.26	4.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	19/ 184	4.86	4.45	4.16	4.62	4.86
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	4.51	4.22	4.37	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	36/ 184	4.83	4.55	4.48	4.66	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.58	4.36	4.47	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	21/ 165	4.83	4.31	4.18	4.29	4.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 2	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: BIOL 625 1
 Title Immunology
 Instructor: Rosenberg, Suzan
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 180
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.09	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1422/1459	3.00	4.02	4.22	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.93	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.98	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.04	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.87	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	3.92	4.09	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.69	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.21	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.30	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.04	4.00	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	3.94	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.27	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.27	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	3.96	4.03	4.01	4.00

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	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	1	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	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1032/1509	4.11	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1463/1509	3.00	4.09	4.26	4.25	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1225/1287	3.22	4.08	4.30	4.22	3.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1212/1459	3.71	4.02	4.22	4.16	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	623/1406	4.22	3.93	4.09	4.12	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1384	****	3.98	4.11	4.16	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1188/1489	3.78	4.04	4.17	4.14	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.87	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1194/1463	3.63	3.92	4.09	4.15	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1160/1438	4.13	4.45	4.46	4.49	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	1162/1421	4.50	4.69	4.73	4.78	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	1204/1411	3.75	4.21	4.31	4.33	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	987/1405	4.13	4.30	4.32	4.33	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	1197/1236	2.50	4.04	4.00	3.98	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	370/1260	4.57	3.94	4.14	4.21	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.27	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	878/1258	4.14	4.27	4.38	4.50	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	3.96	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.45	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.51	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.55	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.58	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	4.31	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.50	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.50	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.26	****

Course-Section: BIOL 626 1
 Title Approaches To Molec Bi
 Instructor: Oneill,Michael
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 181
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 635L 1
 Title Adv Molec Biol Lab
 Instructor: Wolf,Julia B
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 182
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: BIOL 642 2
 Title Intro To Dev Biology
 Instructor: Blumberg,Daphne (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 183
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: BIOL 642 2
 Title Intro To Dev Biology
 Instructor: Brewster,Rachel (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 184
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 700 1
 Title Intro To Grad Experien
 Instructor: Cronin,Thomas W
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 185
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Frequency Distribution

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