

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	3	33	63	73	4.18	977/1639	4.24	4.36	4.27	4.08	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	8	36	68	60	4.01	1082/1639	4.07	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.01	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	11	41	51	68	3.98	1006/1397	4.02	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.98	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	61	7	7	40	30	29	3.59	1370/1583	3.69	4.03	4.19	4.01	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	5	2	23	38	103	4.36	488/1532	4.10	3.80	4.01	3.88	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	79	6	7	27	23	31	3.70	1092/1504	3.68	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	13	43	44	69	3.93	1135/1612	4.01	4.03	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	0	1	0	168	4.96	265/1635	4.96	4.91	4.65	4.56	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	39	2	3	9	54	55	15	3.51	1313/1579	3.81	3.91	4.08	3.95	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	3	14	49	106	4.50	807/1518	4.54	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	7	17	35	112	4.45	1230/1520	4.58	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	6	14	35	62	54	3.84	1217/1517	4.16	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	4	11	32	46	79	4.08	1043/1550	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.17	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	7	8	34	29	83	4.07	590/1295	4.18	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	21	14	33	31	54	3.54	1093/1398	3.70	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	7	7	27	39	73	4.07	950/1391	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	9	9	30	41	64	3.93	1016/1388	3.98	4.16	4.28	4.01	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	29	16	14	22	38	34	3.48	733/ 958	3.57	3.64	3.93	3.71	3.48	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	176	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	176	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	174	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	4.49	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	175	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 281
 Questionnaires: 177

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 176
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	66	0.00-0.99	12	A	40	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	1	Major	53
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	65						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	44	General	0	Under-grad	176	Non-major	124
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	11	D	5						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	147				
				?	7						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	3	33	63	73	4.18	977/1639	4.24	4.36	4.27	4.08	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	8	36	68	60	4.01	1082/1639	4.07	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.01	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	11	41	51	68	3.98	1006/1397	4.02	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.98	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	61	7	7	40	30	29	3.59	1370/1583	3.69	4.03	4.19	4.01	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	5	2	23	38	103	4.36	488/1532	4.10	3.80	4.01	3.88	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	79	6	7	27	23	31	3.70	1092/1504	3.68	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	13	43	44	69	3.93	1135/1612	4.01	4.03	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	0	1	0	168	4.96	265/1635	4.96	4.91	4.65	4.56	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	38	5	0	2	25	63	44	4.11	818/1579	3.81	3.91	4.08	3.95	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	3	8	56	100	4.51	794/1518	4.54	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	2	8	29	128	4.69	992/1520	4.58	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	5	12	61	87	4.37	758/1517	4.16	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	1	4	20	48	95	4.38	787/1550	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.17	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	7	4	10	23	35	88	4.21	497/1295	4.18	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	21	14	33	31	54	3.54	1093/1398	3.70	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	7	7	27	39	73	4.07	950/1391	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	9	9	30	41	64	3.93	1016/1388	3.98	4.16	4.28	4.01	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	29	16	14	22	38	34	3.48	733/ 958	3.57	3.64	3.93	3.71	3.48	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	176	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	176	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	174	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	4.49	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	175	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 281
 Questionnaires: 177

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 177
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	66	0.00-0.99	12	A	40	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	1	Major	53
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	65						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	44	General	0	Under-grad	176	Non-major	124
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	11	D	5						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	147				
				?	7						

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 281
 Questionnaires: 177

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 178
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	0	1	3	33	63	73	4.18	977/1639	4.24	4.36	4.27	4.08	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	2	8	36	68	60	4.01	1082/1639	4.07	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.01	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	11	41	51	68	3.98	1006/1397	4.02	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.98	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	61	7	7	40	30	29	3.59	1370/1583	3.69	4.03	4.19	4.01	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	5	2	23	38	103	4.36	488/1532	4.10	3.80	4.01	3.88	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	79	6	7	27	23	31	3.70	1092/1504	3.68	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	13	43	44	69	3.93	1135/1612	4.01	4.03	4.16	4.10	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	0	1	0	168	4.96	265/1635	4.96	4.91	4.65	4.56	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	40	3	8	11	40	54	21	3.51	1313/1579	3.81	3.91	4.08	3.95	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	2	3	20	42	97	4.40	957/1518	4.54	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	1	8	15	41	99	4.40	1279/1520	4.58	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	5	9	23	65	61	4.03	1065/1517	4.16	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	5	5	24	50	81	4.19	944/1550	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.17	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	9	6	22	38	87	4.16	529/1295	4.18	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	21	14	33	31	54	3.54	1093/1398	3.70	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	7	7	27	39	73	4.07	950/1391	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	9	9	30	41	64	3.93	1016/1388	3.98	4.16	4.28	4.01	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	29	16	14	22	38	34	3.48	733/ 958	3.57	3.64	3.93	3.71	3.48	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	176	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	176	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	174	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	4.49	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	176	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	175	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	176	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 281
 Questionnaires: 177

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 178
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	66	0.00-0.99	12	A	40	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	1	Major	53
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	B	65						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	44	General	0	Under-grad	176	Non-major	124
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	11	D	5						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	147				
				?	7						

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	14	0	4	3	13	31	87	4.41	754/1639	4.24	4.36	4.27	4.08	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	2	5	20	40	71	4.25	859/1639	4.07	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	1	3	9	23	30	72	4.16	878/1397	4.02	4.04	4.28	4.18	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	51	2	5	20	24	36	4.00	1010/1583	3.69	4.03	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	15	40	14	15	20	20	28	3.34	1325/1532	4.10	3.80	4.01	3.88	3.34	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	87	2	9	13	8	18	3.62	1141/1504	3.68	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	1	4	4	19	36	74	4.26	814/1612	4.01	4.03	4.16	4.10	4.26	
8. How many times was class cancelled	15	1	0	1	1	4	130	4.93	463/1635	4.96	4.91	4.65	4.56	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	41	2	4	3	15	44	43	4.09	835/1579	3.81	3.91	4.08	3.95	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	2	7	12	112	4.73	491/1518	4.54	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	1	0	8	11	114	4.77	872/1520	4.58	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	2	4	14	31	82	4.41	726/1517	4.16	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	4	3	7	14	20	90	4.40	778/1550	4.26	4.14	4.22	4.17	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	1	5	4	17	25	78	4.29	428/1295	4.18	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	3	4	20	27	55	4.17	695/1398	3.70	3.87	4.07	3.85	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	3	9	17	21	58	4.13	919/1391	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	5	5	19	22	58	4.13	907/1388	3.98	4.16	4.28	4.01	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	44	37	5	7	16	11	32	3.82	572/ 958	3.57	3.64	3.93	3.71	3.82	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	145	3	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	147	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	146	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	146	1	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 215	****	4.49	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	147	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	148	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	149	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	149	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	147	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	148	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	148	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	150	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	150	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	149	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	149	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	149	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	150	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	150	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	149	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	150	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0201
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 197
 Questionnaires: 152

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 179
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	27	0.00-0.99	9	A	23	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	41
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	39						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	34	General	2	Under-grad	152	Non-major	111
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	89				
				?	4						

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 180
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	814/1639	3.95	4.36	4.27	4.08	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1090/1639	3.71	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1268/1397	3.68	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1449/1583	3.13	4.03	4.19	4.01	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	506/1532	4.08	3.80	4.01	3.88	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1415/1504	3.30	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1044/1612	3.79	4.03	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1232/1579	3.58	3.91	4.08	3.95	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1162/1518	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1318/1520	4.46	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1292/1517	4.05	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1328/1550	4.01	4.14	4.22	4.17	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	929/1295	3.94	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1030/1398	3.50	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	647/1388	4.17	4.16	4.28	4.01	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	949/ 958	2.58	3.64	3.93	3.71	1.50	
Self Paced															
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 181
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	814/1639	3.95	4.36	4.27	4.08	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1090/1639	3.71	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1268/1397	3.68	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1449/1583	3.13	4.03	4.19	4.01	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	506/1532	4.08	3.80	4.01	3.88	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1415/1504	3.30	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1044/1612	3.79	4.03	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1133/1579	3.58	3.91	4.08	3.95	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	947/1518	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.46	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	726/1517	4.05	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	769/1550	4.01	4.14	4.22	4.17	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	978/1295	3.94	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1030/1398	3.50	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	647/1388	4.17	4.16	4.28	4.01	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	949/ 958	2.58	3.64	3.93	3.71	1.50	
Self Paced															
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0201
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 182
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	2	2	3.57	1466/1639	3.95	4.36	4.27	4.08	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	0	3.43	1513/1639	3.71	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1118/1397	3.68	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1563/1583	3.13	4.03	4.19	4.01	2.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	965/1532	4.08	3.80	4.01	3.88	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1154/1504	3.30	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1371/1612	3.79	4.03	4.16	4.10	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	1390/1579	3.58	3.91	4.08	3.95	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1237/1518	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	1345/1520	4.46	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	700/1517	4.05	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	556/1550	4.01	4.14	4.22	4.17	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1295	3.94	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1183/1398	3.50	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	1065/1388	4.17	4.16	4.28	4.01	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	658/ 958	2.58	3.64	3.93	3.71	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0201
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: CRONIN, THOMAS (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 183
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	2	2	3.57	1466/1639	3.95	4.36	4.27	4.08	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	0	3.43	1513/1639	3.71	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1118/1397	3.68	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1563/1583	3.13	4.03	4.19	4.01	2.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	965/1532	4.08	3.80	4.01	3.88	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1154/1504	3.30	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1371/1612	3.79	4.03	4.16	4.10	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1318/1579	3.58	3.91	4.08	3.95	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1069/1518	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1256/1520	4.46	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1276/1517	4.05	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1306/1550	4.01	4.14	4.22	4.17	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	894/1295	3.94	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1183/1398	3.50	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	1065/1388	4.17	4.16	4.28	4.01	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	658/ 958	2.58	3.64	3.93	3.71	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 3	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 7 Non-major 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	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 6	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	25	33	61	72	47	3.35	1543/1639	3.35	4.36	4.27	4.08	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	30	34	69	63	42	3.22	1559/1639	3.22	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	39	39	66	54	38	3.06	1358/1397	3.06	4.04	4.28	4.18	3.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	5	28	39	57	69	40	3.23	1489/1583	3.23	4.03	4.19	4.01	3.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	2	17	27	42	67	80	3.71	1092/1532	3.71	3.80	4.01	3.88	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	25	35	72	64	39	3.24	1344/1504	3.24	3.75	4.05	3.78	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	42	45	56	51	39	3.00	1519/1612	3.00	4.03	4.16	4.10	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	3	0	0	2	54	172	4.75	899/1635	4.75	4.91	4.65	4.56	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	66	6	32	35	70	31	5	2.66	1541/1579	2.66	3.91	4.08	3.95	2.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	78	0	20	27	39	37	44	3.35	1448/1518	3.35	4.39	4.43	4.38	3.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	80	0	9	18	30	44	64	3.82	1454/1520	3.82	4.59	4.70	4.61	3.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	84	0	21	25	45	43	27	3.19	1436/1517	3.19	4.07	4.27	4.20	3.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	75	7	31	31	37	39	25	2.98	1447/1550	2.98	4.14	4.22	4.17	2.98
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	87	5	30	14	41	39	29	3.15	1135/1295	3.15	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	230	0	5	0	2	4	4	3.13	****/1398	****	3.87	4.07	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	233	0	3	1	2	4	2	3.08	****/1391	****	4.24	4.30	4.07	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	224	0	2	1	2	12	4	3.71	****/1388	****	4.16	4.28	4.01	****
4. Were special techniques successful	233	4	1	3	2	0	2	2.88	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	3.71	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	68	1	13	12	31	52	68	3.85	161/ 224	3.85	4.48	4.10	3.90	3.85
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	67	0	7	16	28	57	70	3.94	158/ 240	3.94	4.44	4.11	4.01	3.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	68	0	5	6	13	43	110	4.40	139/ 219	4.40	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.40
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	66	4	9	5	14	44	103	4.30	131/ 215	4.30	4.49	4.35	4.43	4.30
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	67	0	13	17	28	54	66	3.80	157/ 198	3.80	3.89	4.18	4.25	3.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	241	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	241	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	241	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	238	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	241	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	243	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	244	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	244	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	244	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	244	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	244	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	244	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	244	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	243	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	244	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 282
 Questionnaires: 245

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 184
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	6	A	15	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	26	1.00-1.99	0	B	58						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	12	C	16	General	1	Under-grad	245	Non-major	214
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	20	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	83				
				?	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	9	0	1	0	3	15	34	4.53	593/1639	4.53	4.36	4.27	4.08	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	2	4	15	32	4.39	709/1639	4.39	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	1	1	3	2	20	28	4.31	740/1397	4.31	4.04	4.28	4.18	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	25	1	2	3	9	14	4.14	910/1583	4.14	4.03	4.19	4.01	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	14	9	1	9	11	10	3.30	1343/1532	3.30	3.80	4.01	3.88	3.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	45	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	****/1504	****	3.75	4.05	3.78	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	1	0	1	2	12	38	4.64	340/1612	4.64	4.03	4.16	4.10	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	2	0	0	0	16	36	4.69	968/1635	4.69	4.91	4.65	4.56	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	4	1	1	4	21	13	4.10	830/1579	4.10	3.91	4.08	3.95	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	3	50	4.91	213/1518	4.91	4.39	4.43	4.38	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	7	46	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.59	4.70	4.61	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	0	5	8	39	4.58	498/1517	4.58	4.07	4.27	4.20	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	3	1	0	3	8	40	4.65	468/1550	4.65	4.14	4.22	4.17	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	5	1	1	2	11	33	4.54	247/1295	4.54	4.03	3.94	3.84	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	1	3	5	6	10	3.84	912/1398	3.84	3.87	4.07	3.85	3.84	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	1	0	4	11	9	4.08	945/1391	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.07	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	2	0	3	12	12	4.10	918/1388	4.10	4.16	4.28	4.01	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	36	21	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	57	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	4.49	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 106 0101
 Title THE HUMAN ORGANISM
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 117
 Questionnaires: 62

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 185
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	32	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	7	General	5	Under-grad	62	Non-major	59
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	2	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 109 0101
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO
 Instructor: AKINMADE, DAMIL
 Enrollment: 88
 Questionnaires: 71

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 186
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	8	7	28	20	7	3.16	1584/1639	3.16	4.36	4.27	4.08	3.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	9	12	24	18	8	3.06	1577/1639	3.06	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	12	18	20	12	9	2.83	1385/1397	2.83	4.04	4.28	4.18	2.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	5	8	16	26	14	3.52	1398/1583	3.52	4.03	4.19	4.01	3.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	23	9	7	19	7	6	2.88	1464/1532	2.88	3.80	4.01	3.88	2.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	11	12	25	12	9	2.94	1427/1504	2.94	3.75	4.05	3.78	2.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	9	12	17	16	17	3.28	1466/1612	3.28	4.03	4.16	4.10	3.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	6	63	4.87	706/1635	4.87	4.91	4.65	4.56	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	7	8	27	9	1	2.79	1527/1579	2.79	3.91	4.08	3.95	2.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	8	14	16	26	3.81	1351/1518	3.81	4.39	4.43	4.38	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	4	6	13	24	19	3.73	1470/1520	3.73	4.59	4.70	4.61	3.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	10	7	22	16	10	3.14	1443/1517	3.14	4.07	4.27	4.20	3.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	10	8	20	16	11	3.15	1422/1550	3.15	4.14	4.22	4.17	3.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	5	5	10	16	22	3.78	825/1295	3.78	4.03	3.94	3.84	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	10	11	16	11	5	2.81	1322/1398	2.81	3.87	4.07	3.85	2.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	4	10	20	10	9	3.19	1292/1391	3.19	4.24	4.30	4.07	3.19	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	10	16	14	12	3.36	1242/1388	3.36	4.16	4.28	4.01	3.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	28	4	5	2	8	5	3.21	818/ 958	3.21	3.64	3.93	3.71	3.21	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	2	4	9	14	18	3.89	157/ 224	3.89	4.48	4.10	3.90	3.89	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	2	4	7	12	22	4.02	146/ 240	4.02	4.44	4.11	4.01	4.02	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	1	0	0	10	36	4.70	83/ 219	4.70	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	3	1	4	17	21	4.13	147/ 215	4.13	4.49	4.35	4.43	4.13	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	2	3	7	15	20	4.02	128/ 198	4.02	3.89	4.18	4.25	4.02	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	64	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	64	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	63	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	65	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	66	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	66	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	66	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	66	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	66	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	66	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	66	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	66	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	66	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	66	0	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 109 0101
 Title LIFE: INTRO TO MOD BIO
 Instructor: AKINMADE, DAMIL
 Enrollment: 88
 Questionnaires: 71

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 186
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	4	A	8	Required for Majors	53	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	32						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	10	C	17	General	0	Under-grad	71	Non-major	71
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	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	3	0	1	2	6	21	112	4.70	391/1639	4.70	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	6	9	39	88	4.47	567/1639	4.47	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	10	44	85	4.48	560/1397	4.48	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	83	2	3	6	16	31	4.22	822/1583	4.22	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	11	3	6	25	39	55	4.07	722/1532	4.07	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	112	1	0	7	8	11	4.04	****/1504	****	3.75	4.05	4.09	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	6	15	36	81	4.34	706/1612	4.34	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.34	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	1	0	0	83	54	4.37	1265/1635	4.37	4.91	4.65	4.63	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	4	1	0	14	33	66	4.43	473/1579	4.43	3.91	4.08	4.14	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	10	28	98	4.60	684/1518	4.60	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	3	9	125	4.87	648/1520	4.87	4.59	4.70	4.78	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	3	11	30	91	4.55	547/1517	4.55	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	3	3	2	7	21	104	4.61	511/1550	4.61	4.14	4.22	4.33	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	29	3	5	10	26	60	4.30	428/1295	4.30	4.03	3.94	4.07	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	106	0	4	4	8	6	17	3.72	994/1398	3.72	3.87	4.07	4.14	3.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	107	0	0	3	11	8	16	3.97	1007/1391	3.97	4.24	4.30	4.35	3.97	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	92	0	3	6	7	15	22	3.89	1043/1388	3.89	4.16	4.28	4.37	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	107	22	0	3	4	5	4	3.63	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	134	0	1	2	0	1	7	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	136	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	136	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	136	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	****/ 215	****	4.49	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	136	5	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	144	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 251 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 170
 Questionnaires: 145

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 187
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 42	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 2 Major 31
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 0	B 47		
56-83	17	2.00-2.99 14	C 19	General 9	Under-grad 143 Non-major 114
84-150	23	3.00-3.49 35	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00 18	F 0	Electives 10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 2		
			I 0		
			? 9		
				Other 96	

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 188
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	103/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	184/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	216/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	239/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	262/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	617/1612	4.46	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	706/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.63	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	241/1579	4.22	3.91	4.08	4.14	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	149/1518	4.57	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1520	4.54	4.59	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	299/1517	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	122/1550	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.33	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	346/1295	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.07	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1391	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	37/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	38/ 240	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.47	4.77	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	63/ 219	4.78	4.66	4.44	4.61	4.77	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	59/ 215	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.43	4.77	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 189
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	103/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	184/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	216/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	239/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	262/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	617/1612	4.46	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	706/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.63	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1133/1579	4.22	3.91	4.08	4.14	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1518	4.57	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1520	4.54	4.59	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1517	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1550	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.33	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1295	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.07	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1391	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	37/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	4.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	38/ 240	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.47	4.77	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	63/ 219	4.78	4.66	4.44	4.61	4.77	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	59/ 215	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.43	4.77	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	13
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0102
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 190
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	12	4.60	508/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	774/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	906/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1010/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	722/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	546/1612	4.46	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	197/1579	4.22	3.91	4.08	4.14	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	989/1518	4.57	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	1074/1520	4.54	4.59	4.70	4.78	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	661/1517	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1077/1550	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.33	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	623/1295	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1207/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1146/1391	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1095/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	2.60	3.64	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	62/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	45/ 240	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.47	4.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	76/ 219	4.78	4.66	4.44	4.61	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	181/ 215	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.43	3.91	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0					
				I 0	Other 14				
				? 1					

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0102
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 191
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	12	4.60	508/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	774/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	906/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1010/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	722/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	546/1612	4.46	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1579	4.22	3.91	4.08	4.14	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1518	4.57	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1520	4.54	4.59	4.70	4.78	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1517	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1198/1550	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.33	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1207/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1146/1391	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1095/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	2.60	3.64	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	62/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	45/ 240	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.47	4.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	76/ 219	4.78	4.66	4.44	4.61	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	181/ 215	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.43	3.91	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	5	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	14				
				? 1						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0102
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 192
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	12	4.60	508/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	774/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	906/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1010/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	722/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	546/1612	4.46	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.63	5.00	
Lecture															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	2	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	1491/1550	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.33	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1207/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1146/1391	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1095/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	2.60	3.64	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	62/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	4.45	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	45/ 240	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.47	4.73	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	76/ 219	4.78	4.66	4.44	4.61	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	181/ 215	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.43	3.91	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0103
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 193
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	1	13	4.63	482/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1090/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	859/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1010/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	677/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1249/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	802/1612	4.46	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1102/1579	4.22	3.91	4.08	4.14	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1175/1518	4.57	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	1305/1520	4.54	4.59	4.70	4.78	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1211/1517	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.34	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	1043/1550	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.33	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	1	4	0	3	3.33	1067/1295	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.07	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	1171/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	983/1391	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1047/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	2.60	3.64	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	88/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	56/ 240	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.47	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	67/ 219	4.78	4.66	4.44	4.61	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	119/ 215	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.43	4.42	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	9	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	3.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0103
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 193
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	4	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0103
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 194
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	1	13	4.63	482/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1090/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	859/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1010/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	677/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1249/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	802/1612	4.46	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	889/1579	4.22	3.91	4.08	4.14	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	989/1518	4.57	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	1356/1520	4.54	4.59	4.70	4.78	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1036/1517	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.34	3.97	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	972/1550	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.33	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	943/1295	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.07	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	1171/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	983/1391	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1047/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	2.60	3.64	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	88/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	56/ 240	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.47	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	67/ 219	4.78	4.66	4.44	4.61	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	119/ 215	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.43	4.42	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	9	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	3.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0103
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 194
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	4	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0104
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 195
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	17	4.89	179/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	382/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	392/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	423/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	256/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	958/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	293/1612	4.46	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	255/1579	4.22	3.91	4.08	4.14	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1518	4.57	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	4.54	4.59	4.70	4.78	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	141/1517	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1550	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.33	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	6	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	783/1295	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.07	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	477/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	363/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	907/ 958	2.60	3.64	3.93	4.00	2.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	29/ 240	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.47	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	31/ 219	4.78	4.66	4.44	4.61	4.92	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	62/ 215	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.43	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 251L 0104
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 196
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	17	4.89	179/1639	4.75	4.36	4.27	4.35	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	382/1639	4.43	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	392/1397	4.41	4.04	4.28	4.39	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	423/1583	4.29	4.03	4.19	4.28	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	15	4.63	256/1532	4.33	3.80	4.01	4.09	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	958/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.09	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	293/1612	4.46	4.03	4.16	4.21	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1094/1579	4.22	3.91	4.08	4.14	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	684/1518	4.57	4.39	4.43	4.48	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1414/1520	4.54	4.59	4.70	4.78	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	474/1517	4.44	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	944/1550	4.09	4.14	4.22	4.33	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1295	3.83	4.03	3.94	4.07	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	477/1398	3.63	3.87	4.07	4.14	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	363/1388	4.08	4.16	4.28	4.37	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	4	2	1	0	1	1	2.60	907/ 958	2.60	3.64	3.93	4.00	2.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 224	4.61	4.48	4.10	4.33	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	29/ 240	4.75	4.44	4.11	4.47	4.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	31/ 219	4.78	4.66	4.44	4.61	4.92	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	62/ 215	4.40	4.49	4.35	4.43	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	3.89	4.18	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: MENDELSON, TAMR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 224
 Questionnaires: 101

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 197
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	4	10	37	48	4.30	841/1639	4.30	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	17	40	40	4.19	915/1639	4.19	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	15	43	38	4.15	888/1397	4.15	4.04	4.28	4.26	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	30	5	3	14	17	29	3.91	1143/1583	3.91	4.03	4.19	4.24	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	5	12	24	28	26	3.61	1176/1532	3.61	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	35	3	8	13	16	22	3.74	1059/1504	3.74	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	6	17	31	40	4.08	989/1612	4.08	4.03	4.16	4.12	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	1	2	2	91	4.87	721/1635	4.87	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	2	12	48	19	4.04	871/1579	4.03	3.91	4.08	4.07	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	1	4	23	62	4.58	708/1518	4.55	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	2	4	19	63	4.63	1087/1520	4.70	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	2	11	26	49	4.39	747/1517	4.33	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	3	11	19	56	4.44	729/1550	4.44	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	2	5	8	21	50	4.30	421/1295	4.37	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	59	0	3	2	7	11	19	3.98	805/1398	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.98	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	59	0	1	1	7	12	21	4.21	847/1391	4.21	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	58	0	1	0	8	10	24	4.30	802/1388	4.30	4.16	4.28	4.34	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	58	12	2	4	5	7	13	3.81	577/ 958	3.81	3.64	3.93	3.97	3.81	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors		6	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	38							
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	12	C	11	General		3	Under-grad	101	Non-major	74
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	17	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		57				
				?	2							

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 224
 Questionnaires: 101

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 198
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	4	10	37	48	4.30	841/1639	4.30	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	17	40	40	4.19	915/1639	4.19	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	15	43	38	4.15	888/1397	4.15	4.04	4.28	4.26	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	30	5	3	14	17	29	3.91	1143/1583	3.91	4.03	4.19	4.24	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	5	12	24	28	26	3.61	1176/1532	3.61	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	35	3	8	13	16	22	3.74	1059/1504	3.74	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	6	17	31	40	4.08	989/1612	4.08	4.03	4.16	4.12	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	1	2	2	91	4.87	721/1635	4.87	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	1	3	3	14	28	23	3.92	1039/1579	4.03	3.91	4.08	4.07	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	2	2	3	15	50	4.51	794/1518	4.55	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	31	0	0	1	3	10	56	4.73	943/1520	4.70	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	2	1	13	19	34	4.19	956/1517	4.33	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	30	1	1	3	9	15	42	4.34	823/1550	4.44	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	4	2	3	7	12	42	4.35	391/1295	4.37	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	59	0	3	2	7	11	19	3.98	805/1398	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.98	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	59	0	1	1	7	12	21	4.21	847/1391	4.21	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	58	0	1	0	8	10	24	4.30	802/1388	4.30	4.16	4.28	4.34	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	58	12	2	4	5	7	13	3.81	577/ 958	3.81	3.64	3.93	3.97	3.81	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors		6	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	38							
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	12	C	11	General		3	Under-grad	101	Non-major	74
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	17	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		57				
				?	2							

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 224
 Questionnaires: 101

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 199
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	4	10	37	48	4.30	841/1639	4.30	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	17	40	40	4.19	915/1639	4.19	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	15	43	38	4.15	888/1397	4.15	4.04	4.28	4.26	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	30	5	3	14	17	29	3.91	1143/1583	3.91	4.03	4.19	4.24	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	5	12	24	28	26	3.61	1176/1532	3.61	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	35	3	8	13	16	22	3.74	1059/1504	3.74	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	6	17	31	40	4.08	989/1612	4.08	4.03	4.16	4.12	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	1	1	2	2	91	4.87	721/1635	4.87	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	2	0	1	10	41	22	4.14	795/1579	4.03	3.91	4.08	4.07	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	1	1	2	23	51	4.56	733/1518	4.55	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	4	11	62	4.75	890/1520	4.70	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	0	8	29	39	4.41	726/1517	4.33	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	7	20	49	4.55	580/1550	4.44	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	1	1	1	6	21	47	4.47	289/1295	4.37	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	59	0	3	2	7	11	19	3.98	805/1398	3.98	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.98	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	59	0	1	1	7	12	21	4.21	847/1391	4.21	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.21	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	58	0	1	0	8	10	24	4.30	802/1388	4.30	4.16	4.28	4.34	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	58	12	2	4	5	7	13	3.81	577/ 958	3.81	3.64	3.93	3.97	3.81	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	23	Required for Majors		6	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	38							
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	12	C	11	General		3	Under-grad	101	Non-major	74
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	17	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		57				
				?	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	8	0	3	2	16	55	81	4.33	814/1639	4.33	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	4	5	31	61	56	4.02	1082/1639	4.02	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.02	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	3	18	18	60	58	3.97	1018/1397	3.97	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	106	3	4	14	12	17	3.72	1282/1583	3.72	4.03	4.19	4.24	3.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	21	33	29	26	32	16	2.77	1474/1532	2.77	3.80	4.01	4.05	2.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	125	3	4	8	8	9	3.50	****/1504	****	3.75	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	2	4	9	20	40	81	4.20	872/1612	4.20	4.03	4.16	4.12	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	2	1	0	0	3	150	4.95	331/1635	4.95	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	37	1	3	5	28	54	37	3.92	1022/1579	3.92	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	1	8	32	113	4.65	629/1518	4.65	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	1	5	25	122	4.73	943/1520	4.73	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	6	23	56	67	4.17	973/1517	4.17	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	4	5	13	32	101	4.43	742/1550	4.43	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	17	12	10	24	47	39	3.69	882/1295	3.69	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	143	0	2	1	4	8	7	3.77	****/1398	****	3.87	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	143	0	1	0	4	6	11	4.18	****/1391	****	4.24	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	129	0	1	1	5	18	11	4.03	****/1388	****	4.16	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	143	16	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	163	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	162	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	160	2	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	4.49	4.35	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	163	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	163	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	163	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	162	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	163	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	162	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	161	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	162	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	3	A	36	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	60
28-55	25	1.00-1.99	0	B	56						
56-83	18	2.00-2.99	7	C	28	General	7	Under-grad	164	Non-major	105
84-150	20	3.00-3.49	23	D	2						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	44	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	126				

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0101
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 201
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	7	10	4.42	726/1639	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	7	6	3.74	1369/1639	3.70	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	6	4.16	888/1397	3.96	4.04	4.28	4.26	4.16	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	10	7	4.16	891/1583	3.95	4.03	4.19	4.24	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	3	3	5	2	3.29	1350/1532	3.33	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	0	9	5	4.13	735/1504	3.50	3.75	4.05	4.12	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	6	6	3.83	1229/1612	3.74	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	889/1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	720/1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	925/1520	4.36	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	12	2	4	3.47	1358/1517	3.48	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	1077/1550	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	2	1	6	7	3.78	825/1295	3.54	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	675/1398	4.02	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	694/1391	4.11	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	764/1388	3.90	4.16	4.28	4.34	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	885/ 958	3.39	3.64	3.93	3.97	2.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	51/ 224	4.24	4.48	4.10	4.06	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	125/ 240	3.93	4.44	4.11	4.08	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	67/ 219	4.55	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	62/ 215	4.39	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	6	5	5	3.94	141/ 198	3.49	3.89	4.18	4.04	3.94	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	3.25	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	4.25	4.63	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	3.25	4.13	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0101
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 201
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	14
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	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	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0102
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 202
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	1252/1639	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.28	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	7	6	3.81	1326/1639	3.70	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	8	4.00	973/1397	3.96	4.04	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	939/1583	3.95	4.03	4.19	4.24	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	4	6	2	3	3.13	1402/1532	3.33	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	7	4	4	3.37	1284/1504	3.50	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	1175/1612	3.74	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	3	1	7	4	3.80	1133/1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	5	11	4.24	1110/1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	1256/1520	4.36	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	5	8	4	3.52	1339/1517	3.48	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	8	8	3.95	1119/1550	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.01	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	4	0	3	5	5	3.41	1029/1295	3.54	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	625/1398	4.02	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	863/1391	4.11	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	834/1388	3.90	4.16	4.28	4.34	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 958	3.39	3.64	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	67/ 224	4.24	4.48	4.10	4.06	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	168/ 240	3.93	4.44	4.11	4.08	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	134/ 219	4.55	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	81/ 215	4.39	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	166/ 198	3.49	3.89	4.18	4.04	3.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	3.25	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	4.25	4.63	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	3.25	4.13	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0102
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 202
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	18				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0102
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 203
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	1252/1639	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.28	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	7	7	6	3.81	1326/1639	3.70	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	8	4.00	973/1397	3.96	4.04	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	939/1583	3.95	4.03	4.19	4.24	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	4	6	2	3	3.13	1402/1532	3.33	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	7	4	4	3.37	1284/1504	3.50	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	1175/1612	3.74	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1005/1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	9	3	3.94	1293/1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	1331/1520	4.36	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	1260/1517	3.48	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1048/1550	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.01	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	3	3	2	2	3.30	1081/1295	3.54	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	625/1398	4.02	3.87	4.07	4.13	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	863/1391	4.11	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	834/1388	3.90	4.16	4.28	4.34	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 958	3.39	3.64	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	67/ 224	4.24	4.48	4.10	4.06	4.44	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	168/ 240	3.93	4.44	4.11	4.08	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	134/ 219	4.55	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.44	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	81/ 215	4.39	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	2	3	6	4	3.63	166/ 198	3.49	3.89	4.18	4.04	3.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	3.25	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	4.25	4.63	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	3.25	4.13	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0102
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 203
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	18				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0103
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 204
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	1110/1639	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	1	5	10	2	3.33	1536/1639	3.70	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	6	5	8	3.90	1086/1397	3.96	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.90		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	2	5	6	6	3.57	1378/1583	3.95	4.03	4.19	4.24	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	3	7	1	5	3.22	1371/1532	3.33	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	6	6	4	3.35	1291/1504	3.50	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	4	2	9	3.70	1305/1612	3.74	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	397/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	1	4	3	6	3.63	1257/1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	5	11	4.24	1110/1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.98	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	1136/1520	4.36	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.07	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	6	5	6	3.48	1358/1517	3.48	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	4	5	8	3.76	1232/1550	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	6	5	7	3.89	738/1295	3.54	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/1398	4.02	3.87	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	903/1391	4.11	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1035/1388	3.90	4.16	4.28	4.34	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 958	3.39	3.64	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	103/ 224	4.24	4.48	4.10	4.06	4.21	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	98/ 240	3.93	4.44	4.11	4.08	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	95/ 219	4.55	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	153/ 215	4.39	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.07	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	2	1	7	1	2	3.00	192/ 198	3.49	3.89	4.18	4.04	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	3.25	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	4.25	4.63	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	3.25	4.13	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0103
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 204
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	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	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0103
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 205
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	1110/1639	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	1	5	10	2	3.33	1536/1639	3.70	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	6	5	8	3.90	1086/1397	3.96	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	2	5	6	6	3.57	1378/1583	3.95	4.03	4.19	4.24	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	3	7	1	5	3.22	1371/1532	3.33	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	6	6	4	3.35	1291/1504	3.50	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	4	4	2	9	3.70	1305/1612	3.74	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	397/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	2	6	3	1	3.25	1420/1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	4	7	2	3.71	1381/1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.98	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	8	4	2	3.57	1487/1520	4.36	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.07	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	3	7	2	2	3.21	1431/1517	3.48	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	4	4	2	4	3.13	1428/1550	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.54	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/1398	4.02	3.87	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	903/1391	4.11	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1035/1388	3.90	4.16	4.28	4.34	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 958	3.39	3.64	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	103/ 224	4.24	4.48	4.10	4.06	4.21	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	98/ 240	3.93	4.44	4.11	4.08	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	95/ 219	4.55	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	153/ 215	4.39	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.07	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	2	1	7	1	2	3.00	192/ 198	3.49	3.89	4.18	4.04	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	3.25	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	4.25	4.63	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	3.25	4.13	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0103
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 205
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	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	15				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0104
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 206
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	5	5	4.07	1089/1639	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	5	3.93	1227/1639	3.70	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1063/1397	3.96	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1010/1583	3.95	4.03	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1212/1532	3.33	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	1	4	3.58	1165/1504	3.50	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	6	2	4	3.62	1354/1612	3.74	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	806/1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	919/1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1136/1520	4.36	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1260/1517	3.48	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	912/1550	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	3.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	623/1295	3.54	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	929/1398	4.02	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	927/1391	4.11	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1130/1388	3.90	4.16	4.28	4.34	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	658/ 958	3.39	3.64	3.93	3.97	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	106/ 224	4.24	4.48	4.10	4.06	4.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	209/ 240	3.93	4.44	4.11	4.08	3.45	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	116/ 219	4.55	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.55	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	96/ 215	4.39	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	3	1	4	2	3.50	170/ 198	3.49	3.89	4.18	4.04	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	83/ 85	3.25	4.13	4.58	4.50	3.25	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	65/ 82	4.25	4.63	4.52	4.59	4.25	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	53/ 78	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.60	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	69/ 82	3.25	4.13	4.16	4.08	3.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0104
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 206
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0104
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 207
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	5	5	4.07	1089/1639	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	5	3.93	1227/1639	3.70	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1063/1397	3.96	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1010/1583	3.95	4.03	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1212/1532	3.33	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	1	4	3.58	1165/1504	3.50	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	6	2	4	3.62	1354/1612	3.74	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1409/1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1347/1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1299/1520	4.36	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	5	3	1	3.18	1436/1517	3.48	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	5	2	3.70	1259/1550	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	3.97	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	2	0	3	0	3.20	1122/1295	3.54	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	929/1398	4.02	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	927/1391	4.11	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1130/1388	3.90	4.16	4.28	4.34	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	658/ 958	3.39	3.64	3.93	3.97	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	106/ 224	4.24	4.48	4.10	4.06	4.18	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	209/ 240	3.93	4.44	4.11	4.08	3.45	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	116/ 219	4.55	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.55	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	96/ 215	4.39	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	3	1	4	2	3.50	170/ 198	3.49	3.89	4.18	4.04	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	83/ 85	3.25	4.13	4.58	4.50	3.25	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	65/ 82	4.25	4.63	4.52	4.59	4.25	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	53/ 78	4.00	4.50	4.47	4.60	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	69/ 82	3.25	4.13	4.16	4.08	3.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0104
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 207
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0105
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 208
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	1311/1639	4.04	4.36	4.27	4.28	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	1388/1639	3.70	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	7	5	3.82	1138/1397	3.96	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	967/1583	3.95	4.03	4.19	4.24	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	5	5	4	3.56	1206/1532	3.33	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	1	3	7	2	3.25	1340/1504	3.50	3.75	4.05	4.12	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	2	6	5	3.65	1338/1612	3.74	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	691/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1039/1579	3.74	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	1324/1518	4.10	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	7	9	4.35	1305/1520	4.36	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	7	2	5	3.47	1358/1517	3.48	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	4	4	5	3.47	1340/1550	3.79	4.14	4.22	4.20	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	2	0	6	4	3.77	832/1295	3.54	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	929/1398	4.02	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1192/1391	4.11	4.24	4.30	4.35	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1292/1388	3.90	4.16	4.28	4.34	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 958	3.39	3.64	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	180/ 224	4.24	4.48	4.10	4.06	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	198/ 240	3.93	4.44	4.11	4.08	3.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	145/ 219	4.55	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	158/ 215	4.39	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	162/ 198	3.49	3.89	4.18	4.04	3.70	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	3.25	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	4.25	4.63	4.52	4.59	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 4	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 7
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, DAPHN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 159
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 209
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	5	19	22	4.20	939/1639	4.20	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	17	17	11	3.67	1404/1639	3.67	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	10	11	18	5	3.21	1337/1397	3.21	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	39	3	2	1	2	1	2.56	****/1583	****	4.03	4.19	4.24	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	5	4	7	18	12	3.61	1184/1532	3.61	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	40	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	****/1504	****	3.75	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	7	7	18	13	3.70	1305/1612	3.70	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	46	4.98	199/1635	4.98	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	8	18	15	3	3.24	1423/1579	3.25	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	4	14	27	4.35	1000/1518	4.34	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	0	10	36	4.67	1033/1520	4.55	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	1	11	13	18	3.85	1211/1517	3.80	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	4	9	14	16	3.67	1274/1550	3.64	4.14	4.22	4.20	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	5	5	9	28	4.21	497/1295	4.01	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.01	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	4	1	4	1	1	2.45	****/1398	****	3.87	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	38	0	1	3	1	6	0	3.09	****/1391	****	4.24	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	****/1388	****	4.16	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	36	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.08	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	14	2.00-2.99 5	C 4	General	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 11	D 1	Under-grad	49
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3		
			Other		42
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	19	22	4.20	939/1639	4.20	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	17	17	11	3.67	1404/1639	3.67	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	10	11	18	5	3.21	1337/1397	3.21	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	39	3	2	1	2	1	2.56	****/1583	****	4.03	4.19	4.24	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	5	4	7	18	12	3.61	1184/1532	3.61	3.80	4.01	4.05	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	40	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	****/1504	****	3.75	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	7	7	18	13	3.70	1305/1612	3.70	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	46	4.98	199/1635	4.98	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	3	24	14	1	3.26	1420/1579	3.25	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	2	21	21	4.33	1031/1518	4.34	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	4	15	26	4.43	1247/1520	4.55	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	3	14	15	12	3.76	1260/1517	3.80	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	6	11	10	15	3.62	1289/1550	3.64	4.14	4.22	4.20	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	5	7	13	15	3.81	806/1295	4.01	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.01	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	4	1	4	1	1	2.45	****/1398	****	3.87	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	38	0	1	3	1	6	0	3.09	****/1391	****	4.24	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	2	1	4	3	2	3.17	****/1388	****	4.16	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	36	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.08	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	14	2.00-2.99 5	C 4	General	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 11	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 3	Other	42

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY LAB
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN
 Enrollment: 214
 Questionnaires: 199

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 211
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	55	0	1	5	10	48	80	4.40	762/1639	4.40	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	55	0	0	4	9	37	94	4.53	486/1639	4.53	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	54	0	2	8	17	60	58	4.13	906/1397	4.13	4.04	4.28	4.26	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	56	4	2	6	12	42	77	4.34	697/1583	4.34	4.03	4.19	4.24	4.34	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	55	15	2	6	23	39	59	4.14	677/1532	4.14	3.80	4.01	4.05	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	58	3	1	10	27	44	56	4.04	802/1504	4.04	3.75	4.05	4.12	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	54	0	0	4	14	34	93	4.49	518/1612	4.49	4.03	4.16	4.12	4.49	
8. How many times was class cancelled	56	0	0	1	0	3	139	4.96	331/1635	4.96	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	2	6	72	105	4.51	372/1579	4.51	3.91	4.08	4.07	4.51	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	79	0	0	0	2	8	110	4.90	213/1518	4.90	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	81	0	0	0	3	22	93	4.76	872/1520	4.76	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	80	0	0	1	2	17	99	4.80	251/1517	4.80	4.07	4.27	4.23	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	61	13	2	4	7	23	89	4.54	591/1550	4.54	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	86	37	4	4	13	24	31	3.97	655/1295	3.97	4.03	3.94	3.95	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	164	0	0	2	4	11	18	4.29	****/1398	****	3.87	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	164	0	1	1	8	5	20	4.20	****/1391	****	4.24	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	150	0	2	1	5	22	19	4.12	****/1388	****	4.16	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	163	15	0	3	7	6	5	3.62	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	125	0	2	0	9	18	45	4.41	74/ 224	4.41	4.48	4.10	4.06	4.41	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	125	0	0	0	5	12	57	4.70	49/ 240	4.70	4.44	4.11	4.08	4.70	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	126	0	1	0	4	18	50	4.59	108/ 219	4.59	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.59	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	123	2	0	1	10	10	53	4.55	89/ 215	4.55	4.49	4.35	4.21	4.55	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	128	0	0	1	7	17	46	4.52	58/ 198	4.52	3.89	4.18	4.04	4.52	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	191	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	193	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	194	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	194	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	192	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	195	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	196	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	195	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	195	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	196	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	196	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	195	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	195	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	4.17	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	195	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	195	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY LAB
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN
 Enrollment: 214
 Questionnaires: 199

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 211
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3	A	53	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	94
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	69						
56-83	24	2.00-2.99	11	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	199	Non-major	105
84-150	58	3.00-3.49	36	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	34	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	129				
				?	10						

Course-Section: BIOL 304 0101
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY
 Instructor: BEHRENS, PAUL W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 226
 Questionnaires: 121

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 212
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	10	0	2	2	21	41	45	4.13	1042/1639	4.13	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	1	8	25	40	35	3.92	1244/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	3	9	31	34	33	3.77	1165/1397	3.77	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	83	1	1	4	9	13	4.14	****/1583	****	4.03	4.19	4.24	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	14	32	20	21	13	8	2.41	1509/1532	2.41	3.80	4.01	4.05	2.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	102	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	****/1504	****	3.75	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	5	5	10	19	28	43	3.90	1182/1612	3.90	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	1	1	0	0	0	109	4.96	265/1635	4.96	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	1	15	52	39	4.21	714/1579	3.67	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	5	12	93	4.80	360/1518	4.62	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	8	101	4.93	437/1520	4.81	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	1	1	5	30	71	4.56	523/1517	3.90	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	3	6	18	82	4.61	522/1550	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	13	5	0	10	26	53	4.30	428/1295	4.22	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	97	0	7	3	2	3	9	3.17	****/1398	****	3.87	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	97	0	2	2	4	3	13	3.96	****/1391	****	4.24	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	93	0	3	1	4	6	14	3.96	****/1388	****	4.16	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	98	8	3	0	3	1	8	3.73	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	119	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	4.06	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	119	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	120	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	120	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	120	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 304 0101
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY
 Instructor: BEHRENS, PAUL W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 226
 Questionnaires: 121

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 212
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	40	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	74
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	38						
56-83	22	2.00-2.99	8	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	121	Non-major	47
84-150	42	3.00-3.49	33	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	27	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	101				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 304 0101
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY
 Instructor: LU, HUA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 226
 Questionnaires: 121

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 213
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	10	0	2	2	21	41	45	4.13	1042/1639	4.13	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	1	8	25	40	35	3.92	1244/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	3	9	31	34	33	3.77	1165/1397	3.77	4.04	4.28	4.26	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	83	1	1	4	9	13	4.14	****/1583	****	4.03	4.19	4.24	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	14	32	20	21	13	8	2.41	1509/1532	2.41	3.80	4.01	4.05	2.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	102	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	****/1504	****	3.75	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	5	5	10	19	28	43	3.90	1182/1612	3.90	4.03	4.16	4.12	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	1	1	0	0	0	109	4.96	265/1635	4.96	4.91	4.65	4.66	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	7	11	55	25	7	3.13	1455/1579	3.67	3.91	4.08	4.07	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	6	7	28	65	4.43	905/1518	4.62	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	6	19	79	4.70	979/1520	4.81	4.59	4.70	4.68	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	11	18	26	31	16	3.23	1429/1517	3.90	4.07	4.27	4.23	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	3	7	8	20	23	45	3.88	1171/1550	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	11	4	3	15	20	46	4.15	545/1295	4.22	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	97	0	7	3	2	3	9	3.17	****/1398	****	3.87	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	97	0	2	2	4	3	13	3.96	****/1391	****	4.24	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	93	0	3	1	4	6	14	3.96	****/1388	****	4.16	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	98	8	3	0	3	1	8	3.73	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	119	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	4.06	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	119	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	120	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	120	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	120	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	120	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	120	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: BIOL 304 0101
 Title PLANT BIOLOGY
 Instructor: LU, HUA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 226
 Questionnaires: 121

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 213
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	40	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	74
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	38						
56-83	22	2.00-2.99	8	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	121	Non-major	47
84-150	42	3.00-3.49	33	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	27	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	101				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 425 0101
 Title IMMUNOLOGY
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, SUZA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 214
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	5	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	456/1639	4.64	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	748/1639	4.36	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	5	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	960/1583	4.07	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	950/1532	3.86	3.80	4.01	4.07	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	1026/1504	3.79	3.75	4.05	4.20	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	0	7	6	4.29	779/1612	4.29	4.03	4.16	4.18	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1023/1635	4.64	4.91	4.65	4.72	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	548/1579	4.36	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	529/1518	4.71	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	437/1520	4.93	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1042/1517	4.07	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	814/1550	4.36	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	398/1295	4.33	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1074/1398	3.60	3.87	4.07	4.23	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	3.64	3.93	4.24	4.00	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 426 0101
 Title APPR TO MOLECULAR BIOL
 Instructor: ONEILL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 215
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	1	4	10	3.90	1252/1639	3.90	4.36	4.27	4.42	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	0	5	10	1	3.20	1564/1639	3.20	4.09	4.22	4.29	3.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	9	2	1	3	3	0	2.78	1389/1397	2.78	4.04	4.28	4.38	2.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	4	7	5	1	3.06	1526/1583	3.06	4.03	4.19	4.31	3.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	6	4	3.35	1321/1532	3.35	3.80	4.01	4.07	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	2	1	3	3	0	2.78	1452/1504	2.78	3.75	4.05	4.20	2.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	0	5	10	2	3.40	1441/1612	3.40	4.03	4.16	4.18	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	1	4.05	1475/1635	4.05	4.91	4.65	4.72	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	3	4	6	1	3.20	1438/1579	3.20	3.91	4.08	4.21	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	3	7	4	3.56	1411/1518	3.56	4.39	4.43	4.51	3.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	1136/1520	4.58	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	5	7	5	1	3.00	1453/1517	3.00	4.07	4.27	4.34	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	6	7	1	3.18	1417/1550	3.18	4.14	4.22	4.24	3.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	16	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1295	****	4.03	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	8	6	4.27	616/1398	4.27	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	816/1391	4.25	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1073/1388	3.81	4.16	4.28	4.50	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	14	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 2		

Course-Section: BIOL 430 0101
 Title BIOLOGICAL CHEMISTRY
 Instructor: BUSTOS, MAURICI
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 216
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	19	12	4.20	951/1639	4.20	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	10	11	14	4.11	1003/1639	4.11	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	13	13	4.06	954/1397	4.06	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	10	8	13	3.83	1212/1583	3.83	4.03	4.19	4.31	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	7	11	16	4.17	648/1532	4.17	3.80	4.01	4.07	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	13	8	10	3.66	1123/1504	3.66	3.75	4.05	4.20	3.66	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	15	16	4.34	706/1612	4.34	4.03	4.16	4.18	4.34	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	29	5	4.11	1447/1635	4.11	4.91	4.65	4.72	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	7	16	10	4.09	835/1579	4.09	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	12	23	4.66	616/1518	4.66	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	28	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	8	13	13	4.15	990/1517	4.15	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	18	16	4.43	742/1550	4.43	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	8	10	13	4.16	529/1295	4.16	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	0	7	9	4.41	686/1391	4.41	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	1	9	8	4.26	828/1388	4.26	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.26	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	2	1	3	5	2	3.31	794/ 958	3.31	3.64	3.93	4.24	3.31	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	33	Non-major	20
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	1						
						Other	24				

Course-Section: BIOL 442 0101
 Title DEVELOPMENTAL BIOLOGY
 Instructor: BREWSTER, RACHE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 221
 Questionnaires: 102

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 217
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	12	28	57	4.35	806/1639	4.35	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	7	18	48	23	3.82	1319/1639	3.82	4.09	4.22	4.29	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	5	8	19	35	31	3.81	1151/1397	3.81	4.04	4.28	4.38	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	76	1	2	10	7	3	3.39	****/1583	****	4.03	4.19	4.31	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	7	14	20	25	16	16	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.80	4.01	4.07	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	85	4	2	2	4	2	2.86	****/1504	****	3.75	4.05	4.20	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	9	8	21	23	37	3.72	1294/1612	3.72	4.03	4.16	4.18	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	3	94	4.97	265/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.72	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	4	9	36	24	10	3.33	1394/1579	3.77	3.91	4.08	4.21	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	4	16	30	46	4.16	1162/1518	4.41	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	9	18	69	4.57	1136/1520	4.66	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	13	23	30	29	3.70	1280/1517	4.00	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	7	6	19	21	46	3.94	1135/1550	4.24	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	11	6	5	11	24	38	3.99	644/1295	4.05	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	72	0	8	4	8	6	4	2.80	1323/1398	2.80	3.87	4.07	4.23	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	74	0	5	2	8	7	6	3.25	1281/1391	3.25	4.24	4.30	4.48	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	71	0	4	3	7	10	7	3.42	1221/1388	3.42	4.16	4.28	4.50	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	73	21	2	1	0	4	1	3.13	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	98	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	100	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	98	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.42	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	100	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	99	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	101	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.84	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	101	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	99	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	97	2	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	100	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 34	Required for Majors 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 38	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	10	C 18	General 0
84-150	52	3.00-3.49	30	D 0	Under-grad 100
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	17	F 0	Non-major 52
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 2
				? 3	Other 84
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	12	28	57	4.35	806/1639	4.35	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	7	18	48	23	3.82	1319/1639	3.82	4.09	4.22	4.29	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	5	8	19	35	31	3.81	1151/1397	3.81	4.04	4.28	4.38	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	76	1	2	10	7	3	3.39	****/1583	****	4.03	4.19	4.31	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	7	14	20	25	16	16	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.80	4.01	4.07	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	85	4	2	2	4	2	2.86	****/1504	****	3.75	4.05	4.20	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	9	8	21	23	37	3.72	1294/1612	3.72	4.03	4.16	4.18	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	3	94	4.97	265/1635	4.97	4.91	4.65	4.72	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	2	0	11	35	35	4.22	702/1579	3.77	3.91	4.08	4.21	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	0	7	14	71	4.66	616/1518	4.41	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	4	15	76	4.76	890/1520	4.66	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	4	8	30	51	4.31	833/1517	4.00	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	3	5	21	65	4.54	603/1550	4.24	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	14	2	6	9	26	36	4.11	569/1295	4.05	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	72	0	8	4	8	6	4	2.80	1323/1398	2.80	3.87	4.07	4.23	2.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	74	0	5	2	8	7	6	3.25	1281/1391	3.25	4.24	4.30	4.48	3.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	71	0	4	3	7	10	7	3.42	1221/1388	3.42	4.16	4.28	4.50	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	73	21	2	1	0	4	1	3.13	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	4.24	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	98	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 224	****	4.48	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	100	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.44	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	98	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 219	****	4.66	4.44	4.42	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	100	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	99	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	101	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.84	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	101	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.85	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	99	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 32	****	4.20	4.51	4.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	97	2	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.25	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	100	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.52	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 34	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 2	Major 50
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 38			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	10	C 18	General 0	Under-grad 100	Non-major 52
84-150	52	3.00-3.49	30	D 0			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	17	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 84		
				? 3			

Course-Section: BIOL 451 0101
 Title NEUROBIOLOGY
 Instructor: LIN, WEIHONG (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 219
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	4	22	4.62	482/1639	4.62	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	11	15	4.41	667/1639	4.41	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	632/1397	4.43	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	10	15	4.38	640/1583	4.38	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	356/1532	4.48	3.80	4.01	4.07	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	7	16	4.37	514/1504	4.37	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	2	4	18	4.37	669/1612	4.37	4.03	4.16	4.18	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	3	10	11	4.15	772/1579	4.29	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	7	18	4.48	835/1518	4.49	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	750/1520	4.84	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	11	11	4.03	1065/1517	4.18	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	19	4.45	716/1550	4.52	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	5	6	17	4.43	329/1295	4.41	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	590/1398	4.29	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	557/1391	4.59	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	2	0	3	12	4.47	674/1388	4.47	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	325/ 958	4.31	3.64	3.93	4.24	4.31	
Field Work															
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	8
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 25
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: BIOL 451 0101
 Title NEUROBIOLOGY
 Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYLL (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 220
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	4	22	4.62	482/1639	4.62	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	11	15	4.41	667/1639	4.41	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	632/1397	4.43	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	10	15	4.38	640/1583	4.38	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	356/1532	4.48	3.80	4.01	4.07	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	7	16	4.37	514/1504	4.37	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	2	4	18	4.37	669/1612	4.37	4.03	4.16	4.18	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	11	13	4.42	473/1579	4.29	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	807/1518	4.49	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	24	4.85	674/1520	4.84	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	12	12	4.33	800/1517	4.18	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	533/1550	4.52	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	5	6	15	4.38	361/1295	4.41	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	590/1398	4.29	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	557/1391	4.59	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	2	0	3	12	4.47	674/1388	4.47	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	325/ 958	4.31	3.64	3.93	4.24	4.31	
Field Work															
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	8
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 25
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: BIOL 453 0101
 Title: PHYSIOL BASES OF BEHAV
 Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 221
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	196/1639	4.88	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	393/1639	4.63	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	196/1397	4.86	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	155/1583	4.88	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	469/1532	4.38	3.80	4.01	4.07	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	275/1504	4.63	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.03	4.16	4.18	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	706/1635	4.88	4.91	4.65	4.72	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1579	4.75	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.59	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	109/1295	4.80	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	770/1398	4.00	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	3.64	3.93	4.24	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 476 0101
 Title ANTIBIOTICS
 Instructor: LOVETT, PAUL S
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 222
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	5	19	4.59	518/1639	4.59	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	6	9	6	3.58	1455/1639	3.58	4.09	4.22	4.29	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	10	9	3.93	1063/1397	3.93	4.04	4.28	4.38	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	9	12	4.15	900/1583	4.15	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	8	13	4.22	607/1532	4.22	3.80	4.01	4.07	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	4	9	8	3.80	1010/1504	3.80	3.75	4.05	4.20	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6	2	6	4	8	3.23	1479/1612	3.23	4.03	4.16	4.18	3.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	3	9	5	7	3.56	1289/1579	3.56	3.91	4.08	4.21	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	5	5	7	9	3.77	1364/1518	3.77	4.39	4.43	4.51	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	979/1520	4.70	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	5	9	5	7	3.44	1369/1517	3.44	4.07	4.27	4.34	3.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	8	5	9	3.63	1289/1550	3.63	4.14	4.22	4.24	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	3	5	1	5	4	3.11	1146/1295	3.11	4.03	3.94	4.01	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	3	1	5	3.58	1080/1398	3.58	3.87	4.07	4.23	3.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	4	1	7	4.08	950/1391	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	834/1388	4.25	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	10	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 958	****	3.64	3.93	4.24	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 5		

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES
 Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 223
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	222/1639	4.85	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	241/1639	4.77	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	487/1397	4.54	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	228/1583	4.77	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	317/1532	4.54	3.80	4.01	4.07	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	506/1504	4.38	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	756/1612	4.31	4.03	4.16	4.18	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	352/1579	4.43	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	670/1518	4.61	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.84	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	371/1517	4.68	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	242/1550	4.76	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	167/1295	4.66	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.66	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	309/1398	4.70	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	143/ 958	4.70	3.64	3.93	4.24	4.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	27/ 224	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.49	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	32/ 240	4.80	4.44	4.11	4.26	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	85/ 219	4.70	4.66	4.44	4.42	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	33/ 215	4.90	4.49	4.35	4.28	4.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	91/ 198	4.30	3.89	4.18	4.21	4.30	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.02	****	

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	2	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES
 Instructor: MENDELSON, TAMR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 224
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	222/1639	4.85	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	241/1639	4.77	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	487/1397	4.54	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	228/1583	4.77	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	317/1532	4.54	3.80	4.01	4.07	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	506/1504	4.38	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	756/1612	4.31	4.03	4.16	4.18	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	5	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	889/1579	4.43	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	807/1518	4.61	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	855/1520	4.84	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	451/1517	4.68	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	500/1550	4.76	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	155/1295	4.66	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.66	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	309/1398	4.70	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	143/ 958	4.70	3.64	3.93	4.24	4.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	27/ 224	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.49	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	32/ 240	4.80	4.44	4.11	4.26	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	85/ 219	4.70	4.66	4.44	4.42	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	33/ 215	4.90	4.49	4.35	4.28	4.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	91/ 198	4.30	3.89	4.18	4.21	4.30	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.02	****	

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	2	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES
 Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 225
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	222/1639	4.85	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	241/1639	4.77	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	487/1397	4.54	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	228/1583	4.77	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	317/1532	4.54	3.80	4.01	4.07	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	506/1504	4.38	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	756/1612	4.31	4.03	4.16	4.18	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	302/1579	4.43	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	708/1518	4.61	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	491/1520	4.84	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	405/1517	4.68	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	253/1550	4.76	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	265/1295	4.66	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.66	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	309/1398	4.70	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	143/ 958	4.70	3.64	3.93	4.24	4.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	27/ 224	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.49	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	32/ 240	4.80	4.44	4.11	4.26	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	85/ 219	4.70	4.66	4.44	4.42	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	33/ 215	4.90	4.49	4.35	4.28	4.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	91/ 198	4.30	3.89	4.18	4.21	4.30	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.02	****	

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	2	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 483 0101
 Title EVOL: GENES TO GENOMES
 Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 226
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	222/1639	4.85	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	241/1639	4.77	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	487/1397	4.54	4.04	4.28	4.38	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	228/1583	4.77	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	317/1532	4.54	3.80	4.01	4.07	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	506/1504	4.38	3.75	4.05	4.20	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	756/1612	4.31	4.03	4.16	4.18	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1579	4.43	3.91	4.08	4.21	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	454/1518	4.61	4.39	4.43	4.51	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	890/1520	4.84	4.59	4.70	4.75	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	299/1517	4.68	4.07	4.27	4.34	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	351/1550	4.76	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1295	4.66	4.03	3.94	4.01	4.66	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	309/1398	4.70	3.87	4.07	4.23	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.24	4.30	4.48	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.16	4.28	4.50	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	143/ 958	4.70	3.64	3.93	4.24	4.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	27/ 224	4.80	4.48	4.10	4.49	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	32/ 240	4.80	4.44	4.11	4.26	4.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	85/ 219	4.70	4.66	4.44	4.42	4.70	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	33/ 215	4.90	4.49	4.35	4.28	4.90	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	91/ 198	4.30	3.89	4.18	4.21	4.30	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.13	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.50	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.13	4.16	4.02	****	

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 2	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 13	Non-major 6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 10		
				? 1			

Course-Section: BIOL 635L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 227
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	214/1639	4.86	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	445/1639	4.57	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	767/1397	4.29	4.04	4.28	4.37	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	402/1583	4.57	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.80	4.01	4.10	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	313/1504	4.57	3.75	4.05	4.29	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	934/1612	4.14	4.03	4.16	4.27	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	496/1579	4.10	3.91	4.08	4.17	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	529/1518	4.50	4.39	4.43	4.49	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.64	4.59	4.70	4.79	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	510/1517	4.43	4.07	4.27	4.32	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	401/1550	4.43	4.14	4.22	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	329/1295	4.30	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1398	4.86	3.87	4.07	4.22	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	441/1391	4.71	4.24	4.30	4.47	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1388	4.71	4.16	4.28	4.49	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	3.64	3.93	4.01	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	23/ 224	4.86	4.48	4.10	4.43	4.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	47/ 240	4.71	4.44	4.11	3.96	4.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	110/ 219	4.57	4.66	4.44	4.23	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	70/ 215	4.71	4.49	4.35	4.72	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	86/ 198	4.33	3.89	4.18	4.74	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.13	4.58	4.58	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.63	4.52	4.74	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.50	4.47	4.52	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.13	4.16	4.37	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.78	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	37/ 50	4.33	4.33	4.45	4.39	4.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	20/ 32	4.20	4.20	4.51	4.50	4.20	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	35/ 43	4.17	4.17	4.69	4.61	4.17	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	22/ 32	4.25	4.25	4.37	4.31	4.25	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	15/ 21	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.42	4.50	

Course-Section: BIOL 635L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 227
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 635L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 228
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	214/1639	4.86	4.36	4.27	4.42	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	445/1639	4.57	4.09	4.22	4.26	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	767/1397	4.29	4.04	4.28	4.37	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	402/1583	4.57	4.03	4.19	4.31	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.80	4.01	4.10	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	313/1504	4.57	3.75	4.05	4.29	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	934/1612	4.14	4.03	4.16	4.27	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.91	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1133/1579	4.10	3.91	4.08	4.17	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1069/1518	4.50	4.39	4.43	4.49	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	1256/1520	4.64	4.59	4.70	4.79	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	854/1517	4.43	4.07	4.27	4.32	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	991/1550	4.43	4.14	4.22	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	529/1295	4.30	4.03	3.94	3.95	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1398	4.86	3.87	4.07	4.22	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	441/1391	4.71	4.24	4.30	4.47	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1388	4.71	4.16	4.28	4.49	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	3.64	3.93	4.01	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	23/ 224	4.86	4.48	4.10	4.43	4.86	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	47/ 240	4.71	4.44	4.11	3.96	4.71	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	110/ 219	4.57	4.66	4.44	4.23	4.57	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	70/ 215	4.71	4.49	4.35	4.72	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	86/ 198	4.33	3.89	4.18	4.74	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.13	4.58	4.58	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.63	4.52	4.74	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.50	4.47	4.52	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.13	4.16	4.37	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.78	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	37/ 50	4.33	4.33	4.45	4.39	4.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	20/ 32	4.20	4.20	4.51	4.50	4.20	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	35/ 43	4.17	4.17	4.69	4.61	4.17	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	22/ 32	4.25	4.25	4.37	4.31	4.25	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	15/ 21	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.42	4.50	

Course-Section: BIOL 635L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 228
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						