

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	12	5	36	40	75	3.96	1230/1669	4.04	4.05	4.23	4.02	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	8	16	29	60	55	3.82	1295/1666	3.97	3.85	4.19	4.11	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	13	19	29	37	70	3.79	1124/1421	3.94	3.89	4.24	4.11	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	65	7	8	28	29	31	3.67	1301/1617	3.74	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	3	7	23	40	90	4.27	550/1555	3.87	3.75	4.00	3.92	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	96	11	3	16	10	30	3.64	1205/1543	3.67	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	8	18	34	38	67	3.84	1223/1647	4.03	3.80	4.12	4.06	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	0	2	8	154	4.90	713/1668	4.92	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	37	2	10	7	33	50	32	3.66	1280/1605	3.76	3.67	4.07	3.96	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	4	17	42	101	4.42	923/1514	4.45	4.24	4.39	4.32	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	2	3	15	23	123	4.58	1135/1551	4.64	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	7	14	27	55	59	3.90	1172/1503	3.99	3.95	4.24	4.17	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	8	18	27	44	66	3.87	1189/1506	4.06	3.93	4.26	4.17	3.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	8	10	32	37	71	3.97	631/1311	4.05	3.83	3.85	3.68	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	9	7	18	47	62	4.02	840/1490	3.99	3.66	4.05	3.85	4.02	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	6	8	13	36	80	4.23	893/1502	4.19	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	8	5	19	32	78	4.18	966/1489	4.18	3.85	4.29	4.07	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	26	7	7	22	33	47	3.91	594/1006	3.72	3.90	4.00	3.81	3.91	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	162	6	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	162	0	3	0	3	2	1	2.78	****/ 233	****	4.05	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	164	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.52	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	165	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 223	****	4.12	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	166	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.90	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	164	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	166	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	165	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	166	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	166	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	166	0	3	0	2	0	0	1.80	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	168	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	167	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	167	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	162	0	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	162	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	162	1	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	162	2	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	162	2	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: BIOL 100 0101  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL  
 Enrollment: 258  
 Questionnaires: 171

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 149  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	33	0.00-0.99	6	A	32	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	45
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	67						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	36	General	4	Under-grad	171	Non-major	126
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	1	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	114				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	7	30	49	69	4.12	1077/1669	4.04	4.05	4.23	4.02	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	10	22	52	70	4.12	1019/1666	3.97	3.85	4.19	4.11	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	11	21	59	63	4.09	939/1421	3.94	3.89	4.24	4.11	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	75	2	7	22	22	27	3.81	1218/1617	3.74	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	39	14	14	24	26	35	3.48	1249/1555	3.87	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	107	3	5	13	8	18	3.70	1175/1543	3.67	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	7	26	41	78	4.23	896/1647	4.03	3.80	4.12	4.06	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	2	0	1	0	7	141	4.93	499/1668	4.92	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	40	3	1	5	28	56	26	3.87	1116/1605	3.76	3.67	4.07	3.96	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	3	13	46	92	4.47	845/1514	4.45	4.24	4.39	4.32	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	6	30	116	4.71	973/1551	4.64	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	2	8	22	60	58	4.09	1020/1503	3.99	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	4	8	14	44	81	4.26	909/1506	4.06	3.93	4.26	4.17	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	12	3	8	24	34	67	4.13	519/1311	4.05	3.83	3.85	3.68	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	8	10	20	30	60	3.97	891/1490	3.99	3.66	4.05	3.85	3.97	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	6	4	20	32	66	4.16	944/1502	4.19	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.16	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	2	7	19	35	63	4.19	953/1489	4.18	3.85	4.29	4.07	4.19	
4. Were special techniques successful	32	43	9	6	24	21	24	3.54	750/1006	3.72	3.90	4.00	3.81	3.54	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	151	1	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	152	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	****/ 233	****	4.05	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	149	3	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.52	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	153	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 223	****	4.12	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	153	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 206	****	3.90	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	156	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	156	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	156	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	156	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	155	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	156	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: BIOL 100 0201  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN  
 Enrollment: 207  
 Questionnaires: 159

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 150  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	25	0.00-0.99	8	A	37	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	18	1.00-1.99	0	B	48						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	10	C	37	General	5	Under-grad	159	Non-major	140
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	91				
				?	3						

Course Section: BIOL 100H 0101  
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR  
 Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 151  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1669	4.68	4.05	4.23	4.02	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	472/1666	4.54	3.85	4.19	4.11	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	683/1421	4.30	3.89	4.24	4.11	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	899/1617	3.88	3.83	4.15	3.99	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1555	4.75	3.75	4.00	3.92	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	580/1543	4.17	3.75	4.06	3.86	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	401/1647	4.59	3.80	4.12	4.06	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	591/1605	4.42	3.67	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.24	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1503	4.83	3.95	4.24	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	4.50	3.93	4.26	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	189/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.68	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	3.86	3.66	4.05	3.85	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.68	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	4.92	3.85	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.50	3.90	4.00	3.81	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: BIOL 100H 0201  
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR  
 Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 152  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	590/1669	4.68	4.05	4.23	4.02	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	549/1666	4.54	3.85	4.19	4.11	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	863/1421	4.30	3.89	4.24	4.11	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1334/1617	3.88	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	340/1555	4.75	3.75	4.00	3.92	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	895/1543	4.17	3.75	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	367/1647	4.59	3.80	4.12	4.06	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	373/1605	4.42	3.67	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.24	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.83	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1069/1506	4.50	3.93	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1027/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.68	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	1328/1490	3.86	3.66	4.05	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	632/1502	4.68	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.92	3.85	4.29	4.07	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	381/1006	4.50	3.90	4.00	3.81	4.25	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0101  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 153  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	2	2	3	3	3.08	1591/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	3.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	9	0	3	3.31	1534/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	3.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	4	1	3.08	1354/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	3.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	2	5	2	3.23	1478/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	6	2	3.46	1257/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	3	2	3.15	1375/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	2	3	3	0	2.42	1596/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	2.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	5	2	1	2	0	2.00	1585/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	3	4	0	2.91	1474/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	2.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1509/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	5	2	3	0	2.64	1460/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	2.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	5	1	2	1	2	2.45	1464/1506	2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	2.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	4	0	4	0	2	2.60	1213/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	1	0	1	2.14	1467/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	2.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	3	1	2	2	0	2.38	1485/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	2.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	1	1	2	0	2.29	1476/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	2.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	873/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	192/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	1	5	2	4	3.75	183/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	127/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	1	3	2	3	3	3.33	208/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	3.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	181/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0101  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 153  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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 1	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 2		
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 9	
			? 1		



Course Section: BIOL 100L 0102  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 154  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	6	5	5	3.67	1409/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	7	7	3	3.47	1479/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	7	3	3	3.05	1355/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	3.05	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	9	3	3.61	1328/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	5	7	3.94	872/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	5	6	3.67	1195/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	4	9	1	3.33	1474/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	1068/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	4	7	2	0	2.60	1555/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	4	6	5	3.47	1394/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	3.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	1404/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	3	7	3	3	3.00	1423/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	2	4	5	2	2.83	1428/1506	2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	2.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	3	1	4	7	3.50	939/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	5	1	4	2	1	2.46	1437/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	2.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	4	3	4	0	2	2.46	1478/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	2.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	5	1	5	2	0	2.31	1475/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	2.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	669/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	3.71	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	71/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.55	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	91/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.45	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	72/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.82	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	109/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	138/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.91	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	2	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	2	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0102  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 154  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0104  
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 155  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	4	5	5	4	3.14	1583/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	3.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	6	7	4	1	2.71	1619/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	2.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	7	4	6	3	3.14	1339/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	5	4	8	1	2.95	1534/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	2.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	6	7	4	3.43	1287/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	6	8	2	3.14	1379/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	12	3	2	2	2	2.00	1619/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	1115/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	5	4	8	1	0	2.28	1577/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	6	6	3	3.25	1431/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	3.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	5	8	4	3.52	1488/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	5	8	4	0	2.57	1466/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	2.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	6	5	4	3	1	2.37	1473/1506	2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	2.37	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	4	2	6	4	4	3.10	1104/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	3.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	2	1	2	2	2.80	1395/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	1	1	3	3	3.18	1379/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	3.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	2	2	1	2	2.70	1449/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	2.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	125/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.27	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	121/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.20	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	2	0	4	9	4.33	146/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	126/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	2	0	1	8	4	3.80	150/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0104  
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 155  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0105  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 156  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	7	4	4	0	0	1.80	1666/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	1.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	8	2	0	0	1.80	1663/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	1.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	4	4	4	1	0	2.15	1419/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	2.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	5	5	0	0	2.15	1609/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	2.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	1	3	4	0	2.46	1525/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	2.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	3	5	0	0	2.00	1534/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	5	3	2	2	1	2.31	1601/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	2.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	1087/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	4	1	2	0	0	1.71	1598/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	1.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	5	3	1	0	2.08	1500/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	2.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	3	2	4	4	0	2.69	1548/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	2.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	6	6	0	1	0	1.69	1499/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	1.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	4	2	0	0	1.67	1502/1506	2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	1.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	3	4	3	2	0	2.33	1253/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	2.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	1	1	0	0	1.50	1488/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	1.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	1	2	0	0	1.83	1500/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	1.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	3	1	0	0	1.83	1486/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	1.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	192/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	198/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	112/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	214/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	186/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0105  
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 156  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0106  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 157  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	7	3	5	3.50	1480/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	3	6	3.56	1449/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	2	7	3.78	1128/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	6	5	3.78	1240/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	4	7	4.00	773/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	8	4	5	3.72	1160/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	2	5	5	3.33	1474/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	939/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	3	5	3	1	2.86	1533/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	6	4	5	3.59	1373/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	3.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	10	2	3	3.35	1507/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	4	4	5	2	3.06	1420/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	3.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	4	4	2	2	2.73	1438/1506	2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	2.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	3	1	6	2	3	3.07	1108/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	3.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	1242/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	2	3	1	2	2.90	1424/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	2.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	4	0	3	3.10	1393/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	3.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	908/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	3.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	123/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.29	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	172/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.86	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	126/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	159/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.71	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0106  
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 157  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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	12				
				?	0						



Course Section: BIOL 100L 0107  
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 158  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	7	4	3	6	0	2.40	1657/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	2.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	9	2	6	3	0	2.15	1656/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	2.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	7	5	4	4	0	2.25	1416/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	2.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	8	5	3	1	2.55	1587/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	2.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	2	10	2	3.26	1354/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	5	4	4	1	2.53	1513/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	2.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	8	7	4	1	0	1.90	1629/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	1.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	807/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	8	7	2	0	0	1.65	1600/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	1.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	4	8	2	3	2.90	1474/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	2.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	4	4	3	5	3.16	1520/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.16	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	6	5	3	1	2.53	1471/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	2.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	5	1	3	1	2.05	1489/1506	2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	2.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	5	6	3	2	3	2.58	1217/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	2.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	2	3	1	0	1.92	1477/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	1.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	0	5	3	1	2.92	1421/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	2.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	6	0	6	0	0	2.00	1481/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	140/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	183/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.75	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	112/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.63	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	164/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	2	0	3	2	1	3.00	189/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0201  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 159  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	4	3	3	4	2	2.81	1628/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	2.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	3	5	3	2	2.88	1596/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	2.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	4	4	0	6	1	2.73	1392/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	2.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	4	1	1	6	2	3.07	1504/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	1	5	3	3	3.13	1404/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	4	1	3	5	1	2.86	1472/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	2.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	4	1	2	7	1	3.00	1526/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	1170/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	2	6	0	0	2.40	1568/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	4	4	4	2	3.00	1457/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	3	2	4	6	1	3.00	1525/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	4	1	6	1	2.75	1452/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	2.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	6	3	2	1	2.38	1472/1506	2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	2.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	4	2	4	4	1	2.73	1199/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	2.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	1443/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	2.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	4	0	1	1	1	2.29	1488/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	2.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	4	1	0	2	0	2.00	1481/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	1	5	1	3	3.60	186/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	3.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	146/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	187/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	142/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.30	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	117/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 18	Non-major 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 10		
				? 2			

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0203  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 160  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1320/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	5	3	3.43	1502/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1222/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	6	3	3.64	1312/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	3	3.77	1054/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1115/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	4	4	1	2.86	1552/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	2.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	570/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	7	0	0	2.67	1549/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	7	2	3.71	1337/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	6	4	3	3.64	1480/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	7	1	3.57	1309/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	3.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	3	4	0	2.62	1446/1506	2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	2.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	861/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1265/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1301/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1361/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	3.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	923/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	140/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	189/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.70	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	149/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.30	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	160/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.10	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	168/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.56	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0203  
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 160  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0204  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 161  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	3	0	4	2	2.77	1631/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	2.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	10	0	1	0	1	1.50	1666/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	1.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	3	1	1	2	2.23	1416/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	2.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	4	1	5	0	1	2.36	1600/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	2.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	3	2	3	2.92	1461/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	2.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	3	2	1	2.38	1523/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	2.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	9	0	2	2	0	1.77	1632/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	1.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1170/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	2	2	1	0	2.00	1585/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	3	4	2	1	2.62	1483/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	2.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	1489/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	2	1	3	1	2.55	1469/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	2.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	6	3	0	1	1	1.91	1496/1506	2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	1.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	6	0	2	2	2	2.50	1227/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	2	0	1	2.25	1461/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	2.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	5	1	2	1	0	1.89	1499/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	1.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	3	4	2	0	0	1.89	1484/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	1.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	996/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	2.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	5	0	3	1	1	2.30	226/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	2.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	2	2	4	1	3.20	217/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.20	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	127/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	5	1	3	0	1	2.10	221/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	2.10	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	6	1	2	0	1	1.90	205/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	1.90	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0204  
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 161  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	6				
				?	0						

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0205  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 162  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	5	8	4	0	2.83	1626/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	2.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	8	8	0	0	2.33	1648/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	2.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	4	8	3	0	2.71	1395/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	2.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	5	8	2	0	2.59	1585/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	2.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	4	5	2	3.00	1427/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	4	7	1	1	2.56	1507/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	2.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	11	2	3	1	0	1.65	1634/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	1.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	5	2	5	1	0	2.15	1581/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	4	6	7	0	3.18	1441/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	3.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	4	5	4	3	3.38	1504/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	3.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	11	1	1	3.00	1423/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	4	3	4	1	2.73	1438/1506	2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	2.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	2	7	3	2	3.06	1108/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	3.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	3	2	1	0	2.43	1443/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	2.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	6	1	0	0	2.00	1495/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	2.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	2	3	3	0	0	2.13	1480/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	2.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	2	0	2	5	1	3.30	204/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	3.30	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	2	2	5	1	3.50	203/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	220/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	3.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	6	3	1	0	0	1.50	222/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	1.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	4	1	1	4	0	2.50	202/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	2.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0205  
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 162  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	9				
				?	1						



Course Section: BIOL 100L 0206  
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 163  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	4	6	2	3	2.79	1630/1669	2.97	4.05	4.23	4.02	2.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	2	6	2	3	2.78	1613/1666	2.72	3.85	4.19	4.11	2.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	7	2	5	2	2.79	1387/1421	2.86	3.89	4.24	4.11	2.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	3	3	3.00	1516/1617	2.99	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	8	1	5	3.35	1319/1555	3.34	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	4	5	2	2.84	1474/1543	2.97	3.75	4.06	3.86	2.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	3	5	3	1	2.37	1599/1647	2.45	3.80	4.12	4.06	2.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	1004/1668	4.75	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	6	5	5	2	1	2.32	1575/1605	2.24	3.67	4.07	3.96	2.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	0	6	4	4	3.22	1435/1514	3.08	4.24	4.39	4.32	3.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	4	4	5	4	2	2.79	1546/1551	3.31	4.46	4.66	4.55	2.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	2	7	4	2	2.89	1437/1503	2.75	3.95	4.24	4.17	2.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	8	2	4	3	2	2.42	1467/1506	2.38	3.93	4.26	4.17	2.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	4	4	4	4	2	2.78	1191/1311	2.90	3.83	3.85	3.68	2.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	7	0	3	0	1	1.91	1478/1490	2.40	3.66	4.05	3.85	1.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	4	4	2	0	1	2.09	1493/1502	2.49	3.86	4.26	4.06	2.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	4	1	3	1	1	2.40	1472/1489	2.35	3.85	4.29	4.07	2.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1006	3.07	3.90	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	2	0	0	4	3	3.67	180/ 226	3.72	4.19	4.20	3.98	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	203/ 233	3.78	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	2	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	165/ 225	4.39	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.20	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	164/ 223	3.61	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	177/ 206	3.29	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: BIOL 100L 0206  
 Title: CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA  
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 163  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	14	13	28	4.10	1103/1669	4.10	4.05	4.23	4.02	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	9	18	27	4.16	993/1666	4.16	3.85	4.19	4.11	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	9	18	25	4.02	965/1421	4.02	3.89	4.24	4.11	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	40	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1246/1617	3.76	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	10	8	5	11	15	3.27	1354/1555	3.27	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	45	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	7	13	32	4.33	775/1647	4.33	3.80	4.12	4.06	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	0	12	41	4.72	1004/1668	4.72	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	2	1	7	19	12	3.93	1057/1605	3.93	3.67	4.07	3.96	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	10	40	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.24	4.39	4.32	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	4	7	42	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	2	17	33	4.48	588/1503	4.48	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	3	3	9	38	4.55	604/1506	4.55	3.93	4.26	4.17	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	1	2	16	30	4.53	250/1311	4.53	3.83	3.85	3.68	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	7	3	4	8	9	3.29	1246/1490	3.29	3.66	4.05	3.85	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	1	9	6	12	4.04	1001/1502	4.04	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.04	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	1	1	4	7	15	4.21	941/1489	4.21	3.85	4.29	4.07	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	22	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	53	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.05	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.52	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.12	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	3.90	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: BIOL 106 0101  
 Title THE HUMAN ORGANISM  
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN  
 Enrollment: 84  
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 164  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	13	General	3	Under-grad	58	Non-major	57
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course Section: BIOL 109 0101  
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO  
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 165  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	5	10	4.10	1110/1669	4.02	4.05	4.23	4.02	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	472/1666	4.19	3.85	4.19	4.11	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	538/1421	3.98	3.89	4.24	4.11	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	12	4.38	662/1617	4.16	3.83	4.15	3.99	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	0	4	3	5	3.64	1148/1555	3.73	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	10	7	4.05	869/1543	3.79	3.75	4.06	3.86	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	204/1647	4.32	3.80	4.12	4.06	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	357/1668	4.95	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	769/1605	4.13	3.67	4.07	3.96	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	189/1514	4.79	4.24	4.39	4.32	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	307/1551	4.88	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	277/1503	4.63	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	225/1506	4.69	3.93	4.26	4.17	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	174/1311	4.67	3.83	3.85	3.68	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	923/1490	3.87	3.66	4.05	3.85	3.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	754/1502	4.23	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	456/1489	4.56	3.85	4.29	4.07	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1006	4.01	3.90	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	29/ 226	4.52	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	75/ 233	4.35	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	38/ 225	4.64	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.94	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	85/ 223	4.40	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	76/ 206	4.49	3.90	4.15	4.01	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: BIOL 109 0101  
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO  
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 165  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: BIOL 109 0102  
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO  
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 166  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	633/1669	4.02	4.05	4.23	4.02	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	527/1666	4.19	3.85	4.19	4.11	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	670/1421	3.98	3.89	4.24	4.11	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	626/1617	4.16	3.83	4.15	3.99	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	1227/1555	3.73	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	747/1543	3.79	3.75	4.06	3.86	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	324/1647	4.32	3.80	4.12	4.06	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.95	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	591/1605	4.13	3.67	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	325/1514	4.79	4.24	4.39	4.32	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	732/1551	4.88	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	266/1503	4.63	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	421/1506	4.69	3.93	4.26	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	169/1311	4.67	3.83	3.85	3.68	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	808/1490	3.87	3.66	4.05	3.85	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	754/1502	4.23	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	500/1489	4.56	3.85	4.29	4.07	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	1	2	0	4	3.63	717/1006	4.01	3.90	4.00	3.81	3.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	56/ 226	4.52	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	40/ 233	4.35	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	68/ 225	4.64	4.52	4.50	4.42	4.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	55/ 223	4.40	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.83	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	41/ 206	4.49	3.90	4.15	4.01	4.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: BIOL 109 0102  
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO  
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 166  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



Course Section: BIOL 109 0103  
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO  
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 167  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	6	2	3.46	1498/1669	4.02	4.05	4.23	4.02	3.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	4	2	3.38	1516/1666	4.19	3.85	4.19	4.11	3.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	1	4	2	3.00	1357/1421	3.98	3.89	4.24	4.11	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	1	1	5	3	3.50	1372/1617	4.16	3.83	4.15	3.99	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1192/1555	3.73	3.75	4.00	3.92	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	1	6	1	3.25	1344/1543	3.79	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	5	3	3.46	1411/1647	4.32	3.80	4.12	4.06	3.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	570/1668	4.95	4.80	4.67	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1210/1605	4.13	3.67	4.07	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	631/1514	4.79	4.24	4.39	4.32	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	760/1551	4.88	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	861/1503	4.63	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	706/1506	4.69	3.93	4.26	4.17	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	246/1311	4.67	3.83	3.85	3.68	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	2	4	1	3.00	1328/1490	3.87	3.66	4.05	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	1	3	3	3.40	1338/1502	4.23	3.86	4.26	4.06	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1168/1489	4.56	3.85	4.29	4.07	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1006	4.01	3.90	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	1	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	129/ 226	4.52	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.22	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	201/ 233	4.35	4.05	4.19	4.09	3.60	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	208/ 225	4.64	4.52	4.50	4.42	3.78	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	186/ 223	4.40	4.12	4.35	4.19	3.78	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	150/ 206	4.49	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: BIOL 109 0103  
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO  
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 167  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	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	1				
				?	3						

Course Section: BIOL 109 0104  
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO  
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 168  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	1131/1669	4.02	4.05	4.23	4.02	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	868/1666	4.19	3.85	4.19	4.11	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	969/1421	3.98	3.89	4.24	4.11	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	695/1617	4.16	3.83	4.15	3.99	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	611/1555	3.73	3.75	4.00	3.92	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	5	3	3.67	1195/1543	3.79	3.75	4.06	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	651/1647	4.32	3.80	4.12	4.06	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.95	4.80	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	678/1605	4.13	3.67	4.07	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	360/1514	4.79	4.24	4.39	4.32	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	358/1551	4.88	4.46	4.66	4.55	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	300/1503	4.63	3.95	4.24	4.17	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	380/1506	4.69	3.93	4.26	4.17	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	153/1311	4.67	3.83	3.85	3.68	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	535/1490	3.87	3.66	4.05	3.85	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	438/1502	4.23	3.86	4.26	4.06	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	4.56	3.85	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	307/1006	4.01	3.90	4.00	3.81	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	116/ 226	4.52	4.19	4.20	3.98	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	105/ 233	4.35	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 225	4.64	4.52	4.50	4.42	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	138/ 223	4.40	4.12	4.35	4.19	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	41/ 206	4.49	3.90	4.15	4.01	4.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: BIOL 251 0101  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I  
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES  
 Enrollment: 154  
 Questionnaires: 94

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 169  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	6	14	73	4.72	306/1669	4.72	4.05	4.23	4.34	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	8	22	60	4.47	591/1666	4.47	3.85	4.19	4.29	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	26	58	4.47	594/1421	4.47	3.89	4.24	4.35	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	59	2	1	4	4	23	4.32	728/1617	4.32	3.83	4.15	4.24	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	2	1	14	22	46	4.28	533/1555	4.28	3.75	4.00	3.96	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	69	1	2	4	4	13	4.08	844/1543	4.08	3.75	4.06	4.10	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	4	7	17	61	4.40	651/1647	4.40	3.80	4.12	4.19	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	91	4.96	357/1668	4.96	4.80	4.67	4.59	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	9	36	36	4.30	631/1605	4.30	3.67	4.07	4.15	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	3	2	29	55	4.45	877/1514	4.45	4.24	4.39	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	4	86	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.46	4.66	4.72	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	3	21	62	4.52	546/1503	4.52	3.95	4.24	4.29	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	5	1	18	68	4.62	534/1506	4.62	3.93	4.26	4.33	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	30	3	2	10	14	32	4.15	513/1311	4.15	3.83	3.85	3.96	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	68	0	4	2	6	2	12	3.62	1112/1490	3.62	3.66	4.05	4.11	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	68	0	4	2	5	1	14	3.73	1219/1502	3.73	3.86	4.26	4.31	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	68	0	2	4	5	3	12	3.73	1200/1489	3.73	3.85	4.29	4.36	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	68	17	2	0	1	0	6	3.89	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	85	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	86	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	****/ 233	****	4.05	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	85	1	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	****/ 225	****	4.52	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	86	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	****/ 223	****	4.12	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	86	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 206	****	3.90	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	93	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	93	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	93	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	93	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	93	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	93	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: BIOL 251 0101  
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I  
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES  
 Enrollment: 154  
 Questionnaires: 94

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 169  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 1	A 38	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1 Major 13
28-55	16	1.00-1.99 0	B 31		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 12	C 5	General 13	Under-grad 93 Non-major 81
84-150	20	3.00-3.49 24	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 22	F 1	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 2		
			I 0		
			? 6		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	12	48	55	4.32	828/1669	4.32	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	26	53	35	4.06	1059/1666	4.06	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	2	21	50	37	4.08	939/1421	4.08	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	41	1	4	19	34	16	3.81	1218/1617	3.81	3.83	4.15	4.22	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	1	11	8	38	28	24	3.42	1287/1555	3.42	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	45	6	9	11	22	16	3.52	1256/1543	3.52	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	4	14	46	45	4.21	907/1647	4.21	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	1	2	107	4.94	499/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	0	0	0	25	48	24	3.99	952/1605	3.98	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.98	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	7	32	70	4.55	739/1514	4.65	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	17	92	4.83	732/1551	4.81	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	4	7	38	60	4.41	702/1503	4.39	3.95	4.24	4.28	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	6	26	73	4.59	566/1506	4.59	3.93	4.26	4.30	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	8	3	3	14	31	47	4.18	489/1311	4.33	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	71	0	1	0	10	12	24	4.23	709/1490	4.23	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	71	0	0	0	7	13	27	4.43	729/1502	4.43	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	71	0	0	0	6	12	29	4.49	707/1489	4.49	3.85	4.29	4.35	4.49	
4. Were special techniques successful	70	12	1	2	9	11	13	3.92	594/1006	3.92	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.92	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	115	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	4.17	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	116	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	117	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	117	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	116	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 3	A 35	Required for Majors	5	Graduate 0	Major 44
28-55	16	1.00-1.99 0	B 43				
56-83	16	2.00-2.99 10	C 11	General	9	Under-grad 118	Non-major 74
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 18	D 2				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0				
			I 0	Other	82		
			? 4				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	12	48	55	4.32	828/1669	4.32	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	26	53	35	4.06	1059/1666	4.06	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	2	21	50	37	4.08	939/1421	4.08	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	41	1	4	19	34	16	3.81	1218/1617	3.81	3.83	4.15	4.22	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	1	11	8	38	28	24	3.42	1287/1555	3.42	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	45	6	9	11	22	16	3.52	1256/1543	3.52	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	4	14	46	45	4.21	907/1647	4.21	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	1	2	107	4.94	499/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	2	1	0	19	49	22	4.00	918/1605	3.98	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.98	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	1	2	25	71	4.68	569/1514	4.65	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	0	17	82	4.83	732/1551	4.81	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	1	10	32	56	4.44	653/1503	4.39	3.95	4.24	4.28	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	7	20	72	4.66	484/1506	4.59	3.93	4.26	4.30	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	2	2	0	11	27	55	4.40	333/1311	4.33	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	71	0	1	0	10	12	24	4.23	709/1490	4.23	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	71	0	0	0	7	13	27	4.43	729/1502	4.43	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	71	0	0	0	6	12	29	4.49	707/1489	4.49	3.85	4.29	4.35	4.49	
4. Were special techniques successful	70	12	1	2	9	11	13	3.92	594/1006	3.92	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.92	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	115	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	4.17	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	116	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	117	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	117	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	116	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 3	A 35	Required for Majors	5	Graduate 0	Major	44
28-55	16	1.00-1.99 0	B 43					
56-83	16	2.00-2.99 10	C 11	General	9	Under-grad 118	Non-major	74
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 18	D 2					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
			P 0					
			I 0	Other	82			
			? 4					

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	12	48	55	4.32	828/1669	4.32	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	26	53	35	4.06	1059/1666	4.06	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	2	21	50	37	4.08	939/1421	4.08	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	41	1	4	19	34	16	3.81	1218/1617	3.81	3.83	4.15	4.22	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	1	11	8	38	28	24	3.42	1287/1555	3.42	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	45	6	9	11	22	16	3.52	1256/1543	3.52	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	4	14	46	45	4.21	907/1647	4.21	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	1	2	107	4.94	499/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	32	0	2	3	15	42	24	3.97	987/1605	3.98	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.98	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	1	2	18	69	4.72	489/1514	4.65	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	1	1	14	74	4.79	825/1551	4.81	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	2	2	8	30	47	4.33	811/1503	4.39	3.95	4.24	4.28	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	1	5	20	61	4.54	613/1506	4.59	3.93	4.26	4.30	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	1	3	1	8	21	54	4.40	333/1311	4.33	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	71	0	1	0	10	12	24	4.23	709/1490	4.23	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	71	0	0	0	7	13	27	4.43	729/1502	4.43	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	71	0	0	0	6	12	29	4.49	707/1489	4.49	3.85	4.29	4.35	4.49	
4. Were special techniques successful	70	12	1	2	9	11	13	3.92	594/1006	3.92	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.92	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	115	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	4.17	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	116	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	117	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	117	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	116	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 3	A 35	Required for Majors	5	Graduate 0	Major	44
28-55	16	1.00-1.99 0	B 43					
56-83	16	2.00-2.99 10	C 11	General	9	Under-grad 118	Non-major	74
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 18	D 2					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
			P 0					
			I 0	Other	82			
			? 4					



Course Section: BIOL 302 0101  
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI  
 Instructor: GETHMANN, RICHA  
 Enrollment: 340  
 Questionnaires: 147

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 173  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	3	11	48	81	4.42	705/1669	4.42	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	11	26	44	59	4.01	1088/1666	4.01	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.01	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	7	15	30	40	51	3.79	1121/1421	3.79	3.89	4.24	4.25	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	109	2	4	4	6	18	4.00	****/1617	****	3.83	4.15	4.22	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	14	37	23	27	21	21	2.74	1493/1555	2.74	3.75	4.00	4.03	2.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	120	0	4	6	4	9	3.78	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	7	5	27	37	66	4.06	1017/1647	4.06	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	1	0	2	138	4.96	285/1668	4.96	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	3	1	4	21	57	37	4.04	891/1605	4.04	3.67	4.07	4.09	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	3	7	31	99	4.61	663/1514	4.61	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	2	4	17	117	4.78	843/1551	4.78	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	4	17	49	68	4.29	852/1503	4.29	3.95	4.24	4.28	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	11	30	97	4.59	566/1506	4.59	3.93	4.26	4.30	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	51	7	8	26	18	28	3.60	894/1311	3.60	3.83	3.85	3.97	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	123	0	5	1	5	8	5	3.29	****/1490	****	3.66	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	124	0	0	1	4	8	10	4.17	****/1502	****	3.86	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	124	0	1	1	4	7	10	4.04	****/1489	****	3.85	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	123	19	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	146	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 42	Required for Majors	1
28-55	36	1.00-1.99 0	B 49		Graduate 0
56-83	25	2.00-2.99 13	C 32	General	2
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 21	D 1		Under-grad 147
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 51	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	127
			? 10		

Course Section: BIOL 302L 0101  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 174  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	8	9	4.26	901/1669	4.34	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	2	10	4.00	1094/1666	4.08	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	894/1421	4.33	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	7	9	4.16	911/1617	4.13	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	773/1555	3.66	3.75	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	8	7	4.06	863/1543	3.97	3.75	4.06	4.14	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	1	7	7	4.00	1043/1647	3.91	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	0	17	4.78	939/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	9	3	3.87	1124/1605	3.94	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	2	5	9	3.95	1241/1514	4.27	4.24	4.39	4.46	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	1	4	12	4.37	1289/1551	4.53	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	4	5	7	3.68	1269/1503	3.81	3.95	4.24	4.28	3.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	6	8	3.89	1179/1506	3.97	3.93	4.26	4.30	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	4	4	8	4.06	562/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	824/1490	4.26	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	859/1502	4.26	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	941/1489	4.25	3.85	4.29	4.35	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	759/1006	3.66	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	2	0	0	5	9	4.19	132/ 226	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.17	4.19	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	170/ 233	4.03	4.05	4.19	4.13	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	2	2	2	9	4.00	187/ 225	4.40	4.52	4.50	4.45	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	0	2	4	8	4.00	164/ 223	4.36	4.12	4.35	4.27	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	2	0	4	1	9	3.94	131/ 206	3.86	3.90	4.15	4.08	3.94	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: BIOL 302L 0101  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 174  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course Section: BIOL 302L 0102  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 175  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	852/1669	4.34	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	4	3.92	1206/1666	4.08	3.85	4.19	4.20	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	773/1421	4.33	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	1140/1617	4.13	3.83	4.15	4.22	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	4	2	3.50	1227/1555	3.66	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	1068/1543	3.97	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	885/1647	3.91	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	641/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1249/1605	3.94	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1174/1514	4.27	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	1127/1551	4.53	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	1205/1503	3.81	3.95	4.24	4.28	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1219/1506	3.97	3.93	4.26	4.30	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	818/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.97	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	622/1490	4.26	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	632/1502	4.26	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	953/1489	4.25	3.85	4.29	4.35	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1006	3.66	3.90	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	77/ 226	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.17	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	127/ 233	4.03	4.05	4.19	4.13	4.17	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	119/ 225	4.40	4.52	4.50	4.45	4.58	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	146/ 223	4.36	4.12	4.35	4.27	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	146/ 206	3.86	3.90	4.15	4.08	3.83	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	

Course Section: BIOL 302L 0102  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 175  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course Section: BIOL 302L 0103  
 Title: MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 176  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	10	4	4.00	1173/1669	4.34	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	975/1666	4.08	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	781/1421	4.33	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	1029/1617	4.13	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	7	3	3.53	1217/1555	3.66	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	969/1543	3.97	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	6	4	3.59	1361/1647	3.91	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	654/1605	3.94	3.67	4.07	4.09	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	647/1514	4.27	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	880/1551	4.53	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1035/1503	3.81	3.95	4.24	4.28	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	858/1506	3.97	3.93	4.26	4.30	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	557/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	849/1490	4.26	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	1013/1502	4.26	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	684/1489	4.25	3.85	4.29	4.35	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1006	3.66	3.90	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	77/ 226	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.17	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	131/ 233	4.03	4.05	4.19	4.13	4.14	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	107/ 225	4.40	4.52	4.50	4.45	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	156/ 223	4.36	4.12	4.35	4.27	4.14	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	152/ 206	3.86	3.90	4.15	4.08	3.79	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 11	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 7
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 1
					Other 14

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: BIOL 302L 0104  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 177  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	567/1669	4.34	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	908/1666	4.08	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	538/1421	4.33	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	4.33	717/1617	4.13	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	0	4	6	5	3.71	1104/1555	3.66	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	680/1543	3.97	3.75	4.06	4.14	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	5	8	3.86	1205/1647	3.91	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	357/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	759/1605	3.94	3.67	4.07	4.09	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	600/1514	4.27	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1069/1551	4.53	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	7	6	5	3.74	1245/1503	3.81	3.95	4.24	4.28	3.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	942/1506	3.97	3.93	4.26	4.30	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	3	2	11	4.11	531/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	824/1490	4.26	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	754/1502	4.26	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	3	1	3	4	4	3.33	1341/1489	4.25	3.85	4.29	4.35	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	2	0	2	5	3.80	643/1006	3.66	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	5	2	13	4.40	102/ 226	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.17	4.40	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	100/ 233	4.03	4.05	4.19	4.13	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	1	2	0	17	4.65	105/ 225	4.40	4.52	4.50	4.45	4.65	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	1	0	2	1	16	4.55	103/ 223	4.36	4.12	4.35	4.27	4.55	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	3	1	4	12	4.25	103/ 206	3.86	3.90	4.15	4.08	4.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: BIOL 302L 0104  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 177  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						



Course Section: BIOL 302L 0105  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 178  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	633/1669	4.34	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	0	5	9	4.06	1065/1666	4.08	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	728/1421	4.33	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	887/1617	4.13	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	1163/1555	3.66	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	1	8	3.88	1035/1543	3.97	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	2	9	3.88	1178/1647	3.91	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	864/1605	3.94	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	775/1514	4.27	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.16	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	1055/1551	4.53	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	1127/1503	3.81	3.95	4.24	4.28	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	973/1506	3.97	3.93	4.26	4.30	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	1	8	5	4.07	557/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	422/1490	4.26	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	926/1502	4.26	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	564/1489	4.25	3.85	4.29	4.35	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	694/1006	3.66	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	116/ 226	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.17	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	1	2	3	7	3.80	178/ 233	4.03	4.05	4.19	4.13	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	3	1	0	11	4.27	155/ 225	4.40	4.52	4.50	4.45	4.27	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	98/ 223	4.36	4.12	4.35	4.27	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	5	1	6	3.67	163/ 206	3.86	3.90	4.15	4.08	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: BIOL 302L 0105  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 178  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course Section: BIOL 302L 0105  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 179  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	633/1669	4.34	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	0	5	9	4.06	1065/1666	4.08	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	728/1421	4.33	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	887/1617	4.13	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	5	5	4	3.63	1163/1555	3.66	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	1	8	3.88	1035/1543	3.97	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	2	2	9	3.88	1178/1647	3.91	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1357/1605	3.94	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1307/1514	4.27	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.16	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1361/1551	4.53	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1301/1503	3.81	3.95	4.24	4.28	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1347/1506	3.97	3.93	4.26	4.30	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	422/1490	4.26	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	926/1502	4.26	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	564/1489	4.25	3.85	4.29	4.35	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	694/1006	3.66	3.90	4.00	4.10	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	116/ 226	4.38	4.19	4.20	4.17	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	1	2	3	7	3.80	178/ 233	4.03	4.05	4.19	4.13	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	3	1	0	11	4.27	155/ 225	4.40	4.52	4.50	4.45	4.27	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	98/ 223	4.36	4.12	4.35	4.27	4.60		
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	5	1	6	3.67	163/ 206	3.86	3.90	4.15	4.08	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.47	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: BIOL 302L 0105  
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 179  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	11	29	24	4.12	1077/1669	4.12	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	14	32	13	3.76	1334/1666	3.76	3.85	4.19	4.20	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	8	20	19	16	3.60	1189/1421	3.60	3.89	4.24	4.25	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	46	2	0	4	8	6	3.80	1224/1617	3.80	3.83	4.15	4.22	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	6	19	20	17	3.65	1148/1555	3.65	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	53	3	0	4	2	3	3.17	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	6	13	14	28	3.82	1241/1647	3.82	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	64	4.98	143/1668	4.98	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	3	0	1	11	29	15	4.04	897/1605	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	15	44	4.57	727/1514	4.60	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	5	15	45	4.62	1097/1551	4.65	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	11	26	24	4.11	1015/1503	3.87	3.95	4.24	4.28	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	11	18	33	4.25	917/1506	3.99	3.93	4.26	4.30	3.99	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	20	4	2	11	13	13	3.67	839/1311	3.85	3.83	3.85	3.97	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	48	0	6	2	1	6	4	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.66	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	48	0	1	3	8	3	4	3.32	1363/1502	3.32	3.86	4.26	4.28	3.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	49	0	2	3	6	4	3	3.17	1379/1489	3.17	3.85	4.29	4.35	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	48	15	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	65	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	4.17	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 26		Graduate 0
56-83	15	2.00-2.99 4	C 11	General	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		Under-grad 67
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	57
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	11	29	24	4.12	1077/1669	4.12	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	14	32	13	3.76	1334/1666	3.76	3.85	4.19	4.20	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	8	20	19	16	3.60	1189/1421	3.60	3.89	4.24	4.25	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	46	2	0	4	8	6	3.80	1224/1617	3.80	3.83	4.15	4.22	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	6	19	20	17	3.65	1148/1555	3.65	3.75	4.00	4.03	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	53	3	0	4	2	3	3.17	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	6	13	14	28	3.82	1241/1647	3.82	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	64	4.98	143/1668	4.98	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	3	7	24	18	3	3.20	1470/1605	3.62	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.62	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	5	11	40	4.63	647/1514	4.60	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	3	12	43	4.69	1000/1551	4.65	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	3	10	10	16	18	3.63	1289/1503	3.87	3.95	4.24	4.28	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	6	6	12	8	26	3.72	1254/1506	3.99	3.93	4.26	4.30	3.99	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	3	3	8	18	25	4.04	572/1311	3.85	3.83	3.85	3.97	3.85	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	48	0	6	2	1	6	4	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.66	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	48	0	1	3	8	3	4	3.32	1363/1502	3.32	3.86	4.26	4.28	3.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	49	0	2	3	6	4	3	3.17	1379/1489	3.17	3.85	4.29	4.35	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	48	15	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.10	****	
-----															
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	65	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 226	****	4.19	4.20	4.17	****	
-----															
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	3.49	****	
-----															
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	66	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 26		Graduate 0
56-83	15	2.00-2.99 4	C 11	General	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		Under-grad 67
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	57
			? 1		

Course Section: BIOL 303L 0102  
 Title CELL BIOLOGY LAB  
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN  
 Enrollment: 149  
 Questionnaires: 106

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 182  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	4	36	63	4.52	567/1669	4.52	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	23	79	4.71	293/1666	4.71	3.85	4.19	4.20	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	10	36	55	4.34	737/1421	4.34	3.89	4.24	4.25	4.34	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	1	6	36	57	4.46	568/1617	4.46	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	12	0	4	13	24	49	4.31	508/1555	4.31	3.75	4.00	4.03	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	1	18	39	42	4.19	735/1543	4.19	3.75	4.06	4.14	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	7	28	68	4.59	378/1647	4.59	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	98	4.94	428/1668	4.94	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	31	66	4.63	268/1605	4.63	3.67	4.07	4.09	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	8	90	4.92	170/1514	4.92	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	17	81	4.83	732/1551	4.83	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	15	81	4.84	182/1503	4.84	3.95	4.24	4.28	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	17	76	4.74	367/1506	4.74	3.93	4.26	4.30	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	40	2	1	12	19	19	3.98	609/1311	3.98	3.83	3.85	3.97	3.98	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	70	0	1	2	4	6	23	4.33	622/1490	4.33	3.66	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	71	0	0	1	4	8	22	4.46	693/1502	4.46	3.86	4.26	4.28	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	72	0	0	1	2	12	19	4.44	753/1489	4.44	3.85	4.29	4.35	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	74	10	4	0	4	5	9	3.68	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	2	6	23	55	4.52	74/ 226	4.52	4.19	4.20	4.17	4.52	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	2	3	11	70	4.69	62/ 233	4.69	4.05	4.19	4.13	4.69	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	1	1	20	65	4.71	90/ 225	4.71	4.52	4.50	4.45	4.71	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	6	13	68	4.71	75/ 223	4.71	4.12	4.35	4.27	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	3	19	65	4.71	51/ 206	4.71	3.90	4.15	4.08	4.71	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	103	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.53	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	105	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	105	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	105	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	105	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	105	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	105	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	105	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 38	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 39		Graduate 0
56-83	12	2.00-2.99 13	C 5	General	1 Under-grad 106
84-150	37	3.00-3.49 23	D 0		Non-major 49
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 23	F 0	Electives	0

#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	87	
?	5			



Course Section: BIOL 304 0101  
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: MILLER, STEPHEN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 223  
 Questionnaires: 146

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 183  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	2	3	22	54	62	4.20	988/1669	4.20	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	7	31	62	43	3.99	1122/1666	3.99	3.85	4.19	4.20	3.99	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	6	14	29	56	37	3.73	1141/1421	3.73	3.89	4.24	4.25	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	42	6	10	22	31	30	3.70	1284/1617	3.70	3.83	4.15	4.22	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	45	24	8	29	21	14	2.93	1461/1555	2.93	3.75	4.00	4.03	2.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	89	6	4	12	16	12	3.48	1268/1543	3.48	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	2	4	8	24	46	56	4.03	1032/1647	4.03	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.03	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	1	2	135	4.97	214/1668	4.97	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	3	12	56	43	13	3.40	1400/1605	3.79	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	9	44	86	4.49	814/1514	4.64	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	11	29	100	4.60	1119/1551	4.75	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	9	19	36	40	37	3.55	1318/1503	4.02	3.95	4.24	4.28	4.02	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	8	5	23	36	69	4.09	1033/1506	4.32	3.93	4.26	4.30	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	25	1	6	24	29	53	4.12	525/1311	4.17	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	117	0	7	0	3	9	10	3.52	****/1490	****	3.66	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	118	0	1	1	3	5	18	4.36	****/1502	****	3.86	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	118	0	1	0	4	6	17	4.36	****/1489	****	3.85	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	117	18	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 2	A 47	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 123
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 48		
56-83	10	2.00-2.99 15	C 19	General 2	Under-grad 146 Non-major 23
84-150	59	3.00-3.49 32	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 31	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 128	
			? 11		

Course Section: BIOL 304 0101  
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 223  
 Questionnaires: 146

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 184  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	2	3	22	54	62	4.20	988/1669	4.20	4.05	4.23	4.28	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	7	31	62	43	3.99	1122/1666	3.99	3.85	4.19	4.20	3.99	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	6	14	29	56	37	3.73	1141/1421	3.73	3.89	4.24	4.25	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	42	6	10	22	31	30	3.70	1284/1617	3.70	3.83	4.15	4.22	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	45	24	8	29	21	14	2.93	1461/1555	2.93	3.75	4.00	4.03	2.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	89	6	4	12	16	12	3.48	1268/1543	3.48	3.75	4.06	4.14	3.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	2	4	8	24	46	56	4.03	1032/1647	4.03	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.03	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	1	2	135	4.97	214/1668	4.97	4.80	4.67	4.68	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	43	2	1	1	16	43	40	4.19	769/1605	3.79	3.67	4.07	4.09	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	37	0	0	0	3	18	88	4.78	408/1514	4.64	4.24	4.39	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	37	0	0	0	1	8	100	4.91	512/1551	4.75	4.46	4.66	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	40	0	0	2	8	31	65	4.50	556/1503	4.02	3.95	4.24	4.28	4.02	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	38	0	2	1	8	21	76	4.56	594/1506	4.32	3.93	4.26	4.30	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	43	18	1	6	12	21	45	4.21	470/1311	4.17	3.83	3.85	3.97	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	117	0	7	0	3	9	10	3.52	****/1490	****	3.66	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	118	0	1	1	3	5	18	4.36	****/1502	****	3.86	4.26	4.28	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	118	0	1	0	4	6	17	4.36	****/1489	****	3.85	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	117	18	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 2	A 47	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 48		Major 123
56-83	10	2.00-2.99 15	C 19	General 2	Under-grad 146
84-150	59	3.00-3.49 32	D 0		Non-major 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 31	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 128	
			? 11		

Course Section: BIOL 397W 0101  
 Title SCIENTIFIC WRITING  
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 185  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.05	4.23	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	3.85	4.19	4.20	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1617	5.00	3.83	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	171/1555	4.75	3.75	4.00	4.03	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1543	5.00	3.75	4.06	4.14	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	213/1647	4.75	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1605	5.00	3.67	4.07	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.24	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	5.00	3.95	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	3.93	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	264/1311	4.50	3.83	3.85	3.97	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	4						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course Section: BIOL 411 0101  
 Title BACTERIAL PHYSIOLOGY  
 Instructor: SCHREIER, HAROL  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 186  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	690/1669	4.43	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	12	4.22	935/1666	4.22	3.85	4.19	4.22	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	737/1421	4.35	3.89	4.24	4.38	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1323/1617	3.63	3.83	4.15	4.22	3.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	6	3	8	3.48	1249/1555	3.48	3.75	4.00	4.08	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	15	4.48	532/1647	4.48	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	926/1668	4.78	4.80	4.67	4.70	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	617/1605	4.31	3.67	4.07	4.16	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	600/1514	4.65	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	460/1551	4.91	4.46	4.66	4.73	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	730/1503	4.39	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	380/1506	4.74	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	507/1311	4.15	3.83	3.85	3.88	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	1317/1490	3.10	3.66	4.05	4.26	3.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1172/1502	3.82	3.86	4.26	4.46	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	1013/1489	4.10	3.85	4.29	4.52	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 9	Under-grad 22 Non-major 20
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 1		

Course Section: BIOL 420 0101  
 Title ADV TOPICS:CELL BIOLOG  
 Instructor: MCGRAW, PATRICI  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 187  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	0	3	6	3.77	1329/1666	3.77	3.85	4.19	4.22	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	2	7	3.92	1042/1421	3.92	3.89	4.24	4.38	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	981/1617	4.08	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	728/1555	4.08	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	1	6	3.92	994/1543	3.92	3.75	4.06	4.18	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	549/1647	4.46	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	5	5	2	0	2.75	1658/1668	2.75	4.80	4.67	4.70	2.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1464/1605	3.22	3.67	4.07	4.16	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1383/1514	3.54	4.24	4.39	4.45	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	677/1551	4.85	4.46	4.66	4.73	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1030/1503	4.08	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	882/1311	3.62	3.83	3.85	3.88	3.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	692/1490	4.25	3.66	4.05	4.26	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1502	4.50	3.86	4.26	4.46	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	434/1489	4.75	3.85	4.29	4.52	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	143/1006	4.75	3.90	4.00	4.21	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	199/1669	4.82	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	10	8	4.09	1042/1666	4.09	3.85	4.19	4.22	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	1	8	10	4.09	935/1421	4.09	3.89	4.24	4.38	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	3	1	7	5	3.71	1279/1617	3.71	3.83	4.15	4.22	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	453/1555	4.38	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	1	5	4	2	3.21	1355/1543	3.21	3.75	4.06	4.18	3.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	5	7	6	3.67	1321/1647	3.67	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	6	9	3	3.74	1225/1605	3.74	3.67	4.07	4.16	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	1022/1514	4.33	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.46	4.66	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	5	8	6	3.90	1168/1503	3.90	3.95	4.24	4.27	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	5	11	4.19	958/1506	4.19	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	3	1	6	3	1	2.86	1173/1311	2.86	3.83	3.85	3.88	2.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	604/1490	4.35	3.66	4.05	4.26	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	256/1502	4.88	3.86	4.26	4.46	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	553/1489	4.65	3.85	4.29	4.52	4.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	13	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.21	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	
Field Work															
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.92	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	2.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	6	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						

Course Section: BIOL 430 0101  
 Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: BUSTOS, MAURICI  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 189  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	11	22	4.46	662/1669	4.46	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	5	3	13	15	4.06	1065/1666	4.06	3.85	4.19	4.22	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	3	10	20	4.24	822/1421	4.24	3.89	4.24	4.38	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	4	12	15	3.92	1154/1617	3.92	3.83	4.15	4.22	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	5	9	18	4.06	741/1555	4.06	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	6	9	10	8	3.32	1325/1543	3.32	3.75	4.06	4.18	3.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	11	22	4.38	697/1647	4.38	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	23	4.62	1106/1668	4.62	4.80	4.67	4.70	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	1	2	7	8	13	3.97	987/1605	3.97	3.67	4.07	4.16	3.97	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	0	11	23	4.53	775/1514	4.53	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	30	4.81	788/1551	4.81	4.46	4.66	4.73	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	11	20	4.33	800/1503	4.33	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	9	24	4.56	594/1506	4.56	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	3	5	25	4.49	277/1311	4.49	3.83	3.85	3.88	4.49	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	684/1490	4.27	3.66	4.05	4.26	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	415/1502	4.73	3.86	4.26	4.46	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	596/1489	4.60	3.85	4.29	4.52	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	1	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	360/1006	4.31	3.90	4.00	4.21	4.31	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 3 Major 22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 16		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 35 Non-major 16
84-150	23	3.00-3.49 14	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 28	
			? 1		

Course Section: BIOL 442 0101  
 Title DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: BIEBERICH, CHAR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 230  
 Questionnaires: 97

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 190  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	2	11	28	52	4.29	864/1669	4.29	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	17	44	29	3.98	1136/1666	3.98	3.85	4.19	4.22	3.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	7	21	42	24	3.82	1106/1421	3.82	3.89	4.24	4.38	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	79	2	2	2	5	4	3.47	****/1617	****	3.83	4.15	4.22	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	13	6	20	26	28	3.54	1212/1555	3.54	3.75	4.00	4.08	3.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	86	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	5	13	14	26	34	3.77	1265/1647	3.77	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	3	89	4.97	285/1668	4.97	4.80	4.67	4.70	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	20	46	17	3.96	987/1605	3.96	3.67	4.07	4.16	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	4	26	63	4.57	727/1514	4.50	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	12	81	4.81	760/1551	4.79	4.46	4.66	4.73	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	16	41	36	4.15	978/1503	4.06	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	6	27	58	4.43	731/1506	4.34	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	6	5	20	21	30	3.78	774/1311	3.82	3.83	3.85	3.88	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	72	0	5	2	9	5	4	3.04	1323/1490	3.04	3.66	4.05	4.26	3.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	72	0	4	2	6	5	8	3.44	1323/1502	3.44	3.86	4.26	4.46	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	72	0	1	3	7	6	8	3.68	1218/1489	3.68	3.85	4.29	4.52	3.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	71	17	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 24	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 3 Major 85
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 30		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 7	C 18	General 2	Under-grad 94 Non-major 12
84-150	51	3.00-3.49 31	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 21	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 82	
			? 7		



Course Section: BIOL 442 0101  
 Title DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY  
 Instructor: Eisenmann (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 230  
 Questionnaires: 97

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 191  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	3	2	11	28	52	4.29	864/1669	4.29	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	17	44	29	3.98	1136/1666	3.98	3.85	4.19	4.22	3.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	7	21	42	24	3.82	1106/1421	3.82	3.89	4.24	4.38	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	79	2	2	2	5	4	3.47	****/1617	****	3.83	4.15	4.22	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	13	6	20	26	28	3.54	1212/1555	3.54	3.75	4.00	4.08	3.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	86	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	****/1543	****	3.75	4.06	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	5	13	14	26	34	3.77	1265/1647	3.77	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	2	0	0	0	3	89	4.97	285/1668	4.97	4.80	4.67	4.70	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	22	40	18	3.95	1005/1605	3.96	3.67	4.07	4.16	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	2	10	18	54	4.44	908/1514	4.50	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	0	2	11	72	4.78	843/1551	4.79	4.46	4.66	4.73	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	4	18	32	30	3.98	1096/1503	4.06	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	1	10	26	45	4.24	917/1506	4.34	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	8	3	2	25	17	27	3.85	731/1311	3.82	3.83	3.85	3.88	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	72	0	5	2	9	5	4	3.04	1323/1490	3.04	3.66	4.05	4.26	3.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	72	0	4	2	6	5	8	3.44	1323/1502	3.44	3.86	4.26	4.46	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	72	0	1	3	7	6	8	3.68	1218/1489	3.68	3.85	4.29	4.52	3.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	71	17	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 24	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 3 Major 85
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 30		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 7	C 18	General 2	Under-grad 94 Non-major 12
84-150	51	3.00-3.49 31	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 21	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 82	
			? 7		

Course Section: BIOL 453 0101  
 Title: PHYSIOL BASES OF BEHAV  
 Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 192  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1001/1669	4.18	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1409/1666	3.64	3.85	4.19	4.22	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	935/1421	4.09	3.89	4.24	4.38	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	875/1617	4.18	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	398/1555	4.44	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	453/1543	4.45	3.75	4.06	4.18	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1489/1647	3.30	3.80	4.12	4.14	3.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1232/1668	4.45	4.80	4.67	4.70	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	4	1	2	3.22	1464/1605	3.22	3.67	4.07	4.16	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1118/1514	4.20	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	1111/1551	4.60	4.46	4.66	4.73	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1015/1503	4.10	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1319/1506	3.50	3.93	4.26	4.29	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	818/1311	3.70	3.83	3.85	3.88	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	742/1490	4.20	3.66	4.05	4.26	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502	4.80	3.86	4.26	4.46	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	800/1489	4.40	3.85	4.29	4.52	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	199/1006	4.60	3.90	4.00	4.21	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		10
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	4

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: BIOL 476 0101  
 Title ANTIBIOTICS  
 Instructor: LOVETT, PAUL S  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 193  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	2	15	4.35	804/1669	4.35	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	3	13	4.09	1048/1666	4.09	3.85	4.19	4.22	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	719/1421	4.36	3.89	4.24	4.38	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	11	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	16	4.52	324/1555	4.52	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	4	3	2	10	3.80	1101/1543	3.80	3.75	4.06	4.18	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	3	16	4.39	666/1647	4.39	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	641/1668	4.91	4.80	4.67	4.70	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	851/1605	4.11	3.67	4.07	4.16	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	2	3	15	4.30	1052/1514	4.30	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	622/1551	4.87	4.46	4.66	4.73	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	2	6	11	4.04	1045/1503	4.04	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	5	11	3.87	1194/1506	3.87	3.93	4.26	4.29	3.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	5	0	3	3	6	3.29	1045/1311	3.29	3.83	3.85	3.88	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	956/1490	3.90	3.66	4.05	4.26	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	975/1502	4.10	3.86	4.26	4.46	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	1125/1489	3.90	3.85	4.29	4.52	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1006	****	3.90	4.00	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.05	4.19	4.40	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.52	4.50	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 2 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 7	Under-grad 21 Non-major 15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 1		

Course Section: BIOL 483 0101  
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES  
 Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 194  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	143/1669	4.88	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	527/1666	4.52	3.85	4.19	4.22	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	217/1421	4.80	3.89	4.24	4.38	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	347/1617	4.64	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	262/1555	4.60	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	316/1543	4.58	3.75	4.06	4.18	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	515/1647	4.48	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	239/1605	4.62	3.67	4.07	4.16	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	170/1514	4.94	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	10	13	4.50	556/1503	4.50	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	299/1506	4.79	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	0	5	17	4.54	246/1311	4.68	3.83	3.85	3.88	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	340/1490	4.67	3.66	4.05	4.26	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	119/1502	4.95	3.86	4.26	4.46	4.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	378/1489	4.80	3.85	4.29	4.52	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	6	14	4.52	227/1006	4.52	3.90	4.00	4.21	4.52	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	92/ 226	4.44	4.19	4.20	4.61	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	169/ 233	3.89	4.05	4.19	4.40	3.89	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	102/ 225	4.67	4.52	4.50	4.39	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	138/ 223	4.33	4.12	4.35	4.56	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	86/ 206	4.44	3.90	4.15	4.20	4.44	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D	0
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	2	Graduate
			General	10	Under-grad
			Electives	1	Major
			Other	11	Non-major
					12
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: BIOL 483 0101  
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 195  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	143/1669	4.88	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	527/1666	4.52	3.85	4.19	4.22	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	217/1421	4.80	3.89	4.24	4.38	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	347/1617	4.64	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	262/1555	4.60	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	316/1543	4.58	3.75	4.06	4.18	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	515/1647	4.48	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	210/1605	4.62	3.67	4.07	4.16	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1514	4.94	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	386/1503	4.50	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	249/1506	4.79	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	142/1311	4.68	3.83	3.85	3.88	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	340/1490	4.67	3.66	4.05	4.26	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	119/1502	4.95	3.86	4.26	4.46	4.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	378/1489	4.80	3.85	4.29	4.52	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	6	14	4.52	227/1006	4.52	3.90	4.00	4.21	4.52	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	92/ 226	4.44	4.19	4.20	4.61	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	169/ 233	3.89	4.05	4.19	4.40	3.89	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	102/ 225	4.67	4.52	4.50	4.39	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	138/ 223	4.33	4.12	4.35	4.56	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	86/ 206	4.44	3.90	4.15	4.20	4.44	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D	0
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	2	Graduate
			General	10	Under-grad
			Electives	1	Major
			Other	11	Non-major
					12
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: BIOL 483 0101  
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 196  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	143/1669	4.88	4.05	4.23	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	527/1666	4.52	3.85	4.19	4.22	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	217/1421	4.80	3.89	4.24	4.38	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	347/1617	4.64	3.83	4.15	4.22	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	262/1555	4.60	3.75	4.00	4.08	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	316/1543	4.58	3.75	4.06	4.18	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	515/1647	4.48	3.80	4.12	4.14	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	373/1605	4.62	3.67	4.07	4.16	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	170/1514	4.94	4.24	4.39	4.45	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	800/1503	4.50	3.95	4.24	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	353/1506	4.79	3.93	4.26	4.29	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	142/1311	4.68	3.83	3.85	3.88	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	340/1490	4.67	3.66	4.05	4.26	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	119/1502	4.95	3.86	4.26	4.46	4.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	378/1489	4.80	3.85	4.29	4.52	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	6	14	4.52	227/1006	4.52	3.90	4.00	4.21	4.52	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	92/ 226	4.44	4.19	4.20	4.61	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	169/ 233	3.89	4.05	4.19	4.40	3.89	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	102/ 225	4.67	4.52	4.50	4.39	4.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	138/ 223	4.33	4.12	4.35	4.56	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	86/ 206	4.44	3.90	4.15	4.20	4.44	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 105	****	5.00	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D	0
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	2	Graduate
			General	10	Under-grad
			Electives	1	Major
			Other	11	Non-major
					12
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: BIOL 611 0101  
 Title BACTERIAL PHYSIOLOGY  
 Instructor: SCHREIER, HAROL  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 197  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1332/1669	3.83	4.05	4.23	4.35	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	984/1666	4.17	3.85	4.19	4.19	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	886/1421	4.17	3.89	4.24	4.33	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1207/1617	3.83	3.83	4.15	4.24	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1021/1555	3.80	3.75	4.00	4.07	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	723/1543	4.20	3.75	4.06	4.27	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	948/1647	4.17	3.80	4.12	4.15	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.80	4.67	4.83	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1148/1605	3.83	3.67	4.07	4.13	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.24	4.39	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	800/1503	4.33	3.95	4.24	4.22	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	838/1506	4.33	3.93	4.26	4.24	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.83	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	622/1490	4.33	3.66	4.05	4.18	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	3.86	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	4.67	3.85	4.29	4.44	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	6
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	3				
			? 0						

Course Section: BIOL 620 0101  
 Title ADV TOPICS:CELL BIOLOG  
 Instructor: MCGRAW, PATRICI  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 198  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1648/1669	2.50	4.05	4.23	4.35	2.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	1660/1666	2.00	3.85	4.19	4.19	2.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1357/1421	3.00	3.89	4.24	4.33	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1610/1617	2.00	3.83	4.15	4.24	2.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1545/1555	2.00	3.75	4.00	4.07	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	895/1543	4.00	3.75	4.06	4.27	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1636/1647	1.50	3.80	4.12	4.15	1.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1664/1668	2.50	4.80	4.67	4.83	2.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1501/1605	3.00	3.67	4.07	4.13	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1486/1514	2.50	4.24	4.39	4.37	2.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1489/1551	3.50	4.46	4.66	4.72	3.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1473/1503	2.50	3.95	4.24	4.22	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1490/1506	2.00	3.93	4.26	4.24	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1296/1311	1.00	3.83	3.85	3.89	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.00	3.66	4.05	4.18	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1501/1502	1.00	3.86	4.26	4.46	1.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1489/1489	1.00	3.85	4.29	4.44	1.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1005/1006	1.00	3.90	4.00	4.11	1.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	55/ 55	1.00	1.00	4.34	4.45	1.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	42/ 42	2.00	2.00	4.31	4.40	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



Course Section: BIOL 635L 0101  
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB  
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 199  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.05	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	118/1666	4.89	3.85	4.19	4.19	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1421	4.89	3.89	4.24	4.33	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1617	4.89	3.83	4.15	4.24	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	398/1555	4.44	3.75	4.00	4.07	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	344/1543	4.56	3.75	4.06	4.27	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	194/1647	4.78	3.80	4.12	4.15	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	107/1605	4.61	3.67	4.07	4.13	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1514	4.94	4.24	4.39	4.37	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	144/1503	4.94	3.95	4.24	4.22	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	188/1506	4.94	3.93	4.26	4.24	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	142/1311	4.88	3.83	3.85	3.89	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	155/1490	4.89	3.66	4.05	4.18	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1502	5.00	3.86	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.85	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.11	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 226	5.00	4.19	4.20	4.47	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.05	4.19	4.41	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.52	4.50	4.65	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.12	4.35	4.48	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	3.90	4.15	4.39	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.38	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.36	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.23	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.53	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.06	4.57	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: BIOL 635L 0101  
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB  
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 199  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	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	4	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	4						

Course Section: BIOL 635L 0101  
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 200  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.05	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	118/1666	4.89	3.85	4.19	4.19	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1421	4.89	3.89	4.24	4.33	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1617	4.89	3.83	4.15	4.24	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	398/1555	4.44	3.75	4.00	4.07	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	344/1543	4.56	3.75	4.06	4.27	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	194/1647	4.78	3.80	4.12	4.15	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	591/1605	4.61	3.67	4.07	4.13	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1514	4.94	4.24	4.39	4.37	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.46	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	4.94	3.95	4.24	4.22	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	4.94	3.93	4.26	4.24	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1311	4.88	3.83	3.85	3.89	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	155/1490	4.89	3.66	4.05	4.18	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1502	5.00	3.86	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.85	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.11	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 226	5.00	4.19	4.20	4.47	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.05	4.19	4.41	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.52	4.50	4.65	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.12	4.35	4.48	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	3.90	4.15	4.39	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.38	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.36	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.23	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.53	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.06	4.57	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	1.00	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	2.00	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: BIOL 635L 0101  
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 200  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	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	4	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	4						

Course Section: BIOL 653 0101  
 Title: PHYSIOL BASES OF BEHAV  
 Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 201  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.05	4.23	4.35	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.67	3.85	4.19	4.19	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.67	3.89	4.24	4.33	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	5.00	3.83	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1555	4.67	3.75	4.00	4.07	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.67	3.75	4.06	4.27	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.80	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.80	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	591/1605	4.33	3.67	4.07	4.13	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	584/1514	4.67	4.24	4.39	4.37	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.46	4.66	4.72	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.67	3.95	4.24	4.22	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	838/1506	4.33	3.93	4.26	4.24	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	389/1311	4.33	3.83	3.85	3.89	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.66	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	3.86	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.85	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	178/1006	4.67	3.90	4.00	4.11	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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