

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	9	14	56	66	64	3.78	1249/1447	3.61	4.48	4.31	4.18	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	12	20	47	77	54	3.67	1258/1447	3.53	4.28	4.27	4.30	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	14	20	46	60	68	3.71	1080/1241	3.44	4.26	4.33	4.25	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	70	18	10	30	48	33	3.49	1268/1402	3.36	4.27	4.24	4.15	3.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	10	7	21	73	92	4.13	718/1358	3.95	4.09	4.11	4.03	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	92	17	13	23	36	25	3.34	1196/1316	3.36	4.13	4.14	3.99	3.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	13	33	44	59	56	3.55	1246/1427	3.51	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	3	11	189	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	51	3	8	22	60	60	7	3.23	1320/1434	3.09	4.03	4.10	4.10	3.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	3	7	35	89	72	4.07	1156/1387	3.97	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	3	11	51	139	4.58	1072/1387	4.31	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	11	24	53	73	44	3.56	1245/1386	3.55	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	25	37	49	45	47	3.26	1297/1380	3.35	4.38	4.32	4.31	3.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	6	15	26	45	51	56	3.55	943/1193	3.48	4.14	4.02	3.99	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	22	15	42	53	51	3.52	990/1172	3.46	4.14	4.15	3.95	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	5	11	26	52	89	4.14	803/1182	3.80	4.29	4.35	4.18	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	9	13	37	47	77	3.93	925/1170	3.48	4.34	4.38	4.17	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	29	15	12	14	36	42	63	3.78	573/ 800	3.78	4.20	4.06	3.95	3.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	205	2	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 189	3.84	4.74	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	206	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	****/ 192	4.07	4.68	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	206	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 186	4.47	4.70	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	206	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 187	4.10	4.67	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	206	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 168	3.89	4.48	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	208	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	208	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	208	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	208	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	208	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	208	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	208	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	208	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	208	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	208	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	208	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	208	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	208	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	208	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: BIOL 100 01  
 Title Concepts Of Biology  
 Instructor: Sokolove,Philli  
 Enrollment: 308  
 Questionnaires: 211

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 146  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	63	0.00-0.99	1	A	62	Required for Majors	Graduate	0	Major	62
28-55	38	1.00-1.99	2	B	57					
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	16	C	51	General	Under-grad	211	Non-major	149
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	31	D	3					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	70	F	2	Electives				
				P	0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other				
				?	9					

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	5	10	29	25	16	3.44	1354/1447	3.61	4.48	4.31	4.18	3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	10	11	21	20	22	3.39	1351/1447	3.53	4.28	4.27	4.30	3.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	14	16	15	21	19	3.18	1201/1241	3.44	4.26	4.33	4.25	3.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	9	21	16	18	20	3.23	1337/1402	3.36	4.27	4.24	4.15	3.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	4	6	22	25	26	3.76	1022/1358	3.95	4.09	4.11	4.03	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	10	7	25	19	19	3.38	1184/1316	3.36	4.13	4.14	3.99	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	10	11	15	23	24	3.48	1265/1427	3.51	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	8	74	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	8	13	27	10	8	2.95	1365/1434	3.09	4.03	4.10	4.10	2.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	7	3	13	29	29	3.86	1238/1387	3.97	4.48	4.46	4.46	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	5	5	14	15	43	4.05	1313/1387	4.31	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.05
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	7	10	17	27	20	3.53	1251/1386	3.55	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	12	8	17	20	24	3.44	1260/1380	3.35	4.38	4.32	4.31	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	13	8	16	18	24	3.41	999/1193	3.48	4.14	4.02	3.99	3.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	60	0	4	5	6	2	11	3.39	1026/1172	3.46	4.14	4.15	3.95	3.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	60	0	5	3	4	6	10	3.46	1089/1182	3.80	4.29	4.35	4.18	3.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	61	0	6	6	3	5	7	3.04	1136/1170	3.48	4.34	4.38	4.17	3.04
4. Were special techniques successful	61	7	4	2	4	2	8	3.40	****/ 800	3.78	4.20	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	1	3	3	15	20	20	3.84	162/ 189	3.84	4.74	4.34	4.18	3.84
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	3	14	20	24	4.07	144/ 192	4.07	4.68	4.34	4.31	4.07
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	1	0	1	6	17	36	4.47	114/ 186	4.47	4.70	4.48	4.46	4.47
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	2	3	12	14	30	4.10	140/ 187	4.10	4.67	4.33	4.37	4.10
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	5	6	10	10	30	3.89	130/ 168	3.89	4.48	4.20	4.29	3.89
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	79	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	81	0	3	1	0	1	2	2.71	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	81	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	82	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	81	1	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	81	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	81	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	81	1	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	82	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	81	2	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	80	0	3	0	1	3	1	2.88	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	80	1	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	80	2	3	1	0	1	1	2.33	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	81	1	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	80	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: BIOL 100 01  
 Title Concepts Of Biology La  
 Instructor: Claassen,Lark A  
 Enrollment: 238  
 Questionnaires: 88

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 147  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	26	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	67	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	36						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	10	C	10	General	1	Under-grad	88	Non-major	74
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	25	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	8	9	16	4.11	998/1447	4.11	4.48	4.31	4.18	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	11	19	4.37	715/1447	4.37	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	7	10	14	3.91	982/1241	3.91	4.26	4.33	4.25	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	7	12	13	4.12	891/1402	4.12	4.27	4.24	4.15	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	7	5	20	4.17	681/1358	4.17	4.09	4.11	4.03	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	7	8	19	4.29	590/1316	4.29	4.13	4.14	3.99	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	11	16	4.18	858/1427	4.18	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	291/1447	4.94	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	3	7	12	2	3.54	1218/1434	3.54	4.03	4.10	4.10	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	10	8	16	4.18	1098/1387	4.18	4.48	4.46	4.46	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	7	24	4.62	1042/1387	4.62	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	8	15	9	3.91	1119/1386	3.91	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	5	16	11	4.09	1000/1380	4.09	4.38	4.32	4.31	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	5	7	19	4.38	395/1193	4.38	4.14	4.02	3.99	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	4	6	3	3.53	986/1172	3.53	4.14	4.15	3.95	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	774/1182	4.19	4.29	4.35	4.18	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	632/1170	4.44	4.34	4.38	4.17	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	18	3	1	2	6	3	2	3.21	728/ 800	3.21	4.20	4.06	3.95	3.21
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.74	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.68	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.70	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.67	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.48	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: BIOL 123 01  
 Title Human Genetics  
 Instructor: Wagner, Cynthia  
 Enrollment: 87  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 148  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	16	Under-grad	35	Non-major	35
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 233 01  
 Title Nutrition And Health  
 Instructor: Host,Laurie A  
 Enrollment: 64  
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 149  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	38	4.80	254/1447	4.80	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	34	4.71	292/1447	4.71	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	7	36	4.71	323/1241	4.71	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	579/1402	4.43	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	3	9	19	4.41	452/1358	4.41	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	31	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	534/1316	4.36	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	38	4.82	140/1427	4.82	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	37	4.84	646/1447	4.84	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	3	19	11	4.24	645/1434	4.24	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	37	4.86	261/1387	4.86	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	36	4.81	758/1387	4.81	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	34	4.77	303/1386	4.77	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	37	4.84	238/1380	4.84	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	4	9	25	4.55	256/1193	4.55	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1172	****	4.14	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	41	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1182	****	4.29	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	41	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1170	****	4.34	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	41	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 34	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 17		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 45 Non-major 38
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 3		

Course-Section: BIOL 252 01  
 Title Anatomy & Physiology I  
 Instructor: Fleischmann,Est  
 Enrollment: 150  
 Questionnaires: 81

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 150  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	12	67	4.85	211/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	25	50	4.57	468/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	7	28	41	4.34	709/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	36	1	1	8	11	22	4.21	818/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	1	0	6	23	40	4.44	409/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	47	1	0	3	7	20	4.45	444/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	8	12	56	4.60	349/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	72	4.92	388/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	5	29	33	4.42	442/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	5	16	56	4.66	566/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	74	4.96	211/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	3	4	20	50	4.52	597/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	13	60	4.72	379/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	18	0	2	5	20	31	4.38	395/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	61	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	****/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	61	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	****/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	61	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	****/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	61	11	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	****/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	80	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	80	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	80	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	80	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 2	A 19	Required for Majors	66
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 43		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 6	C 8	General	1
84-150	14	3.00-3.49 18	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 19	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	2
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	67/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	213/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	542/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	223/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	274/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	52/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	214/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.34
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	140/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	369/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	182/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	111/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	168/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	83/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.63
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	1	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 252 01  
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 152  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	67/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	213/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	542/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	223/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	274/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	52/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	538/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	849/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	83/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.63	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	298/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	702/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	523/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	196/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	122/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	154/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	485/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	634/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	891/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	707/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	733/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	749/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	796/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	350/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	219/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	243/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	318/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	34/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	32/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.81
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	92/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	23/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 18
84-150	4	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 1		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	298/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	702/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	523/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	196/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	122/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	154/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	485/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	8	4	4.07	817/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	684/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	859/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	733/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	463/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	7	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	350/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	219/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	243/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	318/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	34/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	32/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.81
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	92/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	23/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	18
84-150	4	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	1				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	298/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	702/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	523/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	196/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	122/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	154/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	485/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	754/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	337/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	241/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	350/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	219/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	243/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	318/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	34/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	32/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.81
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	92/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.56
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	23/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	11	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 12			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 21	Non-major 18
84-150	4	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 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: BIOL 252 03  
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab  
 Instructor: Fleischmann, Est (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 156  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	254/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	575/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	7	10	4.14	855/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	787/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	345/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	519/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	680/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	754/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	983/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	1039/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	859/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	775/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	887/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	710/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	817/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	763/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	44/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	76/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	80/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	35/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	6	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	28/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 252 03  
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab  
 Instructor: Fleischmann, Est (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 156  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 252 03  
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 157  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	254/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	575/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	7	10	4.14	855/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	787/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	345/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	519/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	680/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	754/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	807/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	353/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	253/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	273/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	652/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	710/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	817/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	763/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	44/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	76/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	80/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	35/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	6	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	28/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****



Course-Section: BIOL 252 03  
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 157  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 252 03  
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 158  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	254/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	575/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	7	10	4.14	855/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	787/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	345/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	519/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	680/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	754/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	849/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.99
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	798/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	784/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	392/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	420/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	652/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	710/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	817/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	763/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	44/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	76/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	80/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	35/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.81
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	6	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	28/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 252 03  
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 158  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	133/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	468/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	345/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	567/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	201/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	608/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	243/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	284/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	353/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	510/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	111/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	11	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	660/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	856/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	763/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	39/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	37/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.79
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	66/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.68
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	68/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.68
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	18	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors		22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General		0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: BIOL 252 04  
 Title Anatomy & Physiol Lab  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 160  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	133/1447	4.85	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	468/1447	4.56	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	345/1241	4.49	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	567/1402	4.46	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	201/1358	4.66	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1316	4.47	4.13	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	608/1427	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	243/1447	4.88	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1024/1434	4.18	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1144/1387	4.59	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	946/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	927/1386	4.57	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	420/1380	4.70	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1193	4.18	4.14	4.02	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	660/1172	4.24	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	856/1182	4.38	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	763/1170	4.49	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 800	4.29	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	39/ 189	4.83	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	37/ 192	4.77	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.79
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	66/ 186	4.67	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.68
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	68/ 187	4.77	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.68
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	18	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	4.67	4.48	4.20	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	14	22	52	4.28	849/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	19	34	35	4.05	1023/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	6	16	31	37	4.03	909/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	48	1	2	9	18	15	3.98	1006/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.24	3.98
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	2	6	20	24	31	3.92	905/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	58	1	1	10	11	9	3.81	962/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	6	11	27	42	4.11	906/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	4	86	4.92	388/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	3	3	24	27	21	3.77	1081/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	9	24	58	4.51	783/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	5	19	65	4.62	1042/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	4	23	27	34	3.97	1079/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	15	25	48	4.29	858/1380	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	2	4	14	26	38	4.12	602/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	69	0	1	3	6	7	7	3.67	925/1172	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.12	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	69	0	1	5	4	6	8	3.63	1047/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	69	0	1	1	9	6	7	3.71	1001/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	69	15	0	3	0	2	4	3.78	****/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	83	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	****/ 189	4.76	4.74	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	83	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	****/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	84	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	****/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	83	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	****/ 187	4.62	4.67	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	83	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	****/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	92	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	92	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	92	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275 01  
 Title Microbiology  
 Instructor: Sandoz, James W (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 178  
 Questionnaires: 93

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 161  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	63	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	32						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	9	C	23	General	1	Under-grad	93	Non-major	71
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	13	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	14	22	52	4.28	849/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	19	34	35	4.05	1023/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	6	16	31	37	4.03	909/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	48	1	2	9	18	15	3.98	1006/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.24	3.98
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	2	6	20	24	31	3.92	905/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	58	1	1	10	11	9	3.81	962/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	6	11	27	42	4.11	906/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	4	86	4.92	388/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	2	4	20	25	20	3.80	1052/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	0	6	18	56	4.58	684/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	1	0	2	14	62	4.72	904/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	2	8	11	22	36	4.04	1034/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	3	12	18	45	4.35	807/1380	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	3	1	3	10	25	36	4.23	501/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	69	0	1	3	6	7	7	3.67	925/1172	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.12	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	69	0	1	5	4	6	8	3.63	1047/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	69	0	1	1	9	6	7	3.71	1001/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	69	15	0	3	0	2	4	3.78	****/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	83	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	****/ 189	4.76	4.74	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	83	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	****/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	84	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	****/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	83	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	****/ 187	4.62	4.67	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	83	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	****/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	92	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	92	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	92	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	92	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****



Course-Section: BIOL 275 01  
 Title Microbiology  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 178  
 Questionnaires: 93

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 162  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	63	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	32						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	9	C	23	General	1	Under-grad	93	Non-major	71
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	13	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	507/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	648/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	766/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	11	4.32	705/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	5	7	4	3.72	1043/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	3.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	8	6	4	3.68	1038/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	5	7	7	3.90	1077/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	754/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	341/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	566/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	1042/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	10	8	4.19	927/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	905/1380	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	5	8	5	3.84	791/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	710/1172	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	952/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	864/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	87/ 189	4.76	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	126/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	28/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	92/ 187	4.62	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.56
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	75/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.31
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275 02  
 Title Microbiology Laborator  
 Instructor: Sandoz,James W  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 163  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	463/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	702/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	646/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	900/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	485/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	748/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	866/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	673/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	817/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	307/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	579/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	691/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	815/1380	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	388/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	218/1172	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	430/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	480/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	308/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	58/ 189	4.76	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	59/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	88/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.58
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	73/ 187	4.62	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	62/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.42
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275 03  
 Title Microbiology Laborator  
 Instructor: Sandoz,James W (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 164  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	463/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	702/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	646/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	9	4.11	900/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	485/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	748/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	866/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	673/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1024/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	611/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1218/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	863/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	946/1380	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	574/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	218/1172	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.12	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	430/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	480/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	308/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	58/ 189	4.76	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	59/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	88/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.58
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	73/ 187	4.62	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	62/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.42
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275 03  
 Title Microbiology Laborator  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 165  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	709/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	741/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	646/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	845/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	893/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	2	6	3	3.77	991/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	971/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	836/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	969/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	712/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	958/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	979/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	877/1380	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1022/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	881/1172	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.12	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	817/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	951/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	537/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	3.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	49/ 189	4.76	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	116/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	58/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	94/ 187	4.62	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	73/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****



Course-Section: BIOL 275 04  
 Title Microbiology Laborator  
 Instructor: Sandoz,James W (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 166  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	709/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	741/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	646/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	845/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	893/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	2	6	3	3.77	991/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	971/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	836/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	5	2	0	3.29	1305/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1015/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1293/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1047/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	739/1380	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	881/1172	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.12	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	817/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	951/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	537/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	3.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	49/ 189	4.76	4.74	4.34	4.47	4.73
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	116/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	58/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	94/ 187	4.62	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	73/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275 04  
 Title Microbiology Laborator  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 167  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	309/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	468/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	427/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	425/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	452/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	812/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	704/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	727/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	712/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	596/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	1006/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	539/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	858/1380	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	759/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	812/1172	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.12	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1005/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	845/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	637/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	3.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 189	4.76	4.74	4.34	4.47	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	39/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	48/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	73/ 187	4.62	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	28/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275 05  
 Title Microbiology Laborator  
 Instructor: Sandoz,James W (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 168  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	309/1447	4.52	4.48	4.31	4.31	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	468/1447	4.35	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	427/1241	4.36	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	425/1402	4.22	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	452/1358	4.11	4.09	4.11	4.12	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	812/1316	3.90	4.13	4.14	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	704/1427	4.12	4.22	4.19	4.14	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	727/1447	4.83	4.75	4.69	4.70	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	4	6	0	3.60	1188/1434	3.89	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1150/1387	4.53	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1306/1387	4.53	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1191/1386	4.15	4.28	4.32	4.24	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	1096/1380	4.25	4.38	4.32	4.30	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	2	0	4	1	2	3.11	1072/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.51
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	812/1172	4.01	4.14	4.15	4.12	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1005/1182	4.03	4.29	4.35	4.30	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	845/1170	4.08	4.34	4.38	4.32	4.11
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	637/ 800	3.91	4.20	4.06	4.01	3.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 189	4.76	4.74	4.34	4.47	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	39/ 192	4.56	4.68	4.34	4.38	4.78
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	48/ 186	4.72	4.70	4.48	4.57	4.78
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	73/ 187	4.62	4.67	4.33	4.46	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	28/ 168	4.45	4.48	4.20	4.15	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.28	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275 05  
 Title Microbiology Laborator  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 169  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	9	10	8	3.79	1241/1447	3.79	4.48	4.31	4.31	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	13	9	2	3.24	1373/1447	3.24	4.28	4.27	4.23	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	10	12	3	3.48	1147/1241	3.48	4.26	4.33	4.35	3.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	5	15	5	3	3.21	1340/1402	3.21	4.27	4.24	4.24	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	3	4	4	1	0	2.25	1346/1358	2.25	4.09	4.11	4.12	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	2	6	10	3	3.43	1160/1316	3.43	4.13	4.14	4.08	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	7	13	2	4	2.90	1368/1427	2.90	4.22	4.19	4.14	2.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	10	10	2	3.50	1238/1434	3.60	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	7	17	4.38	931/1387	4.34	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	5	19	4.41	1197/1387	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	4	15	7	1	3.11	1323/1386	3.36	4.28	4.32	4.24	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	6	9	8	3.61	1218/1380	3.73	4.38	4.32	4.30	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	1	7	4	10	4.05	636/1193	3.95	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	947/1172	3.63	4.14	4.15	4.12	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1047/1182	3.63	4.29	4.35	4.30	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	****/1170	****	4.34	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	4.74	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	4.68	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	4.70	4.48	4.57	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.48	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		9	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General		4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	24
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives		9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		4				





Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	9	10	8	3.79	1241/1447	3.79	4.48	4.31	4.31	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	13	9	2	3.24	1373/1447	3.24	4.28	4.27	4.23	3.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	10	12	3	3.48	1147/1241	3.48	4.26	4.33	4.35	3.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	5	15	5	3	3.21	1340/1402	3.21	4.27	4.24	4.24	3.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	17	3	4	4	1	0	2.25	1346/1358	2.25	4.09	4.11	4.12	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	2	6	10	3	3.43	1160/1316	3.43	4.13	4.14	4.08	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	7	13	2	4	2.90	1368/1427	2.90	4.22	4.19	4.14	2.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	9	13	2	3.71	1125/1434	3.60	4.03	4.10	3.97	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	8	14	4.30	1007/1387	4.34	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.34
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	681/1387	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	10	7	6	3.62	1234/1386	3.36	4.28	4.32	4.24	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	4	10	9	3.85	1133/1380	3.73	4.38	4.32	4.30	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	1	7	6	6	3.85	786/1193	3.95	4.14	4.02	4.04	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	947/1172	3.63	4.14	4.15	4.12	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1047/1182	3.63	4.29	4.35	4.30	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	****/1170	****	4.34	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	21	4	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	4.74	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	4.68	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	4.70	4.48	4.57	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	4.48	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.25	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	7	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	24
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						



Course-Section: BIOL 301 01  
 Title Ecology & Evolution  
 Instructor: Mendelson, Tamra (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 254  
 Questionnaires: 102

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 172  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	4	8	34	54	4.35	781/1447	4.35	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	4	10	37	48	4.30	805/1447	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	4	18	34	42	4.13	861/1241	4.13	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	43	0	6	8	18	25	4.09	923/1402	4.09	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	8	13	8	19	26	22	3.41	1212/1358	3.41	4.09	4.11	4.10	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	46	3	4	11	14	18	3.80	968/1316	3.80	4.13	4.14	4.13	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	3	1	11	25	57	4.36	644/1427	4.36	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	0	1	22	72	4.71	918/1447	4.71	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	37	0	0	0	7	36	22	4.23	657/1434	4.14	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	1	2	9	62	4.78	383/1387	4.67	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	27	0	0	1	1	8	65	4.83	732/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	2	2	19	51	4.61	510/1386	4.50	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	2	2	14	55	4.67	448/1380	4.61	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	2	1	1	6	13	47	4.53	275/1193	4.45	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	2	2	4	9	18	4.11	666/1172	4.11	4.14	4.15	4.24	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	2	2	5	5	21	4.17	781/1182	4.17	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	67	0	1	1	1	7	25	4.54	554/1170	4.54	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	67	6	0	2	8	5	14	4.07	413/ 800	4.07	4.20	4.06	4.12	4.07

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	67	Graduate	0	Major	61
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	44						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	102	Non-major	41
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	24	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	5						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 01  
 Title Ecology & Evolution  
 Instructor: Leips,Jeffery W (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 254  
 Questionnaires: 102

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 173  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	8	34	54	4.35	781/1447	4.35	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	4	10	37	48	4.30	805/1447	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	4	18	34	42	4.13	861/1241	4.13	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	43	0	6	8	18	25	4.09	923/1402	4.09	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	8	13	8	19	26	22	3.41	1212/1358	3.41	4.09	4.11	4.10	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	46	3	4	11	14	18	3.80	968/1316	3.80	4.13	4.14	4.13	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	3	1	11	25	57	4.36	644/1427	4.36	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	0	1	22	72	4.71	918/1447	4.71	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	31	0	0	2	7	38	24	4.18	712/1434	4.14	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	1	5	11	57	4.68	551/1387	4.67	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	0	0	1	7	65	4.88	604/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	28	0	0	3	1	24	46	4.53	587/1386	4.50	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	1	4	17	50	4.56	593/1380	4.61	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	30	2	0	1	5	21	43	4.51	281/1193	4.45	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	2	2	4	9	18	4.11	666/1172	4.11	4.14	4.15	4.24	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	2	2	5	5	21	4.17	781/1182	4.17	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	67	0	1	1	1	7	25	4.54	554/1170	4.54	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	67	6	0	2	8	5	14	4.07	413/ 800	4.07	4.20	4.06	4.12	4.07

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	67	Graduate	0	Major	61
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	44						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	102	Non-major	41
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	24	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	5						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 01  
 Title Ecology & Evolution  
 Instructor: Omland, Kevin E (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 254  
 Questionnaires: 102

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 174  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	4	8	34	54	4.35	781/1447	4.35	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	4	10	37	48	4.30	805/1447	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	4	18	34	42	4.13	861/1241	4.13	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	43	0	6	8	18	25	4.09	923/1402	4.09	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	8	13	8	19	26	22	3.41	1212/1358	3.41	4.09	4.11	4.10	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	46	3	4	11	14	18	3.80	968/1316	3.80	4.13	4.14	4.13	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	3	1	11	25	57	4.36	644/1427	4.36	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	1	0	1	22	72	4.71	918/1447	4.71	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	52	0	1	2	8	23	16	4.02	838/1434	4.14	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	48	0	0	2	5	9	38	4.54	755/1387	4.67	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	48	0	0	0	1	4	49	4.89	579/1387	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	48	0	0	3	6	13	32	4.37	775/1386	4.50	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	1	2	15	36	4.59	560/1380	4.61	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	48	8	0	2	9	8	27	4.30	440/1193	4.45	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	67	0	2	2	4	9	18	4.11	666/1172	4.11	4.14	4.15	4.24	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	2	2	5	5	21	4.17	781/1182	4.17	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	67	0	1	1	1	7	25	4.54	554/1170	4.54	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	67	6	0	2	8	5	14	4.07	413/ 800	4.07	4.20	4.06	4.12	4.07

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	67	Graduate	0	Major	61
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	44						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	102	Non-major	41
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	24	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	1	6	27	77	4.62	452/1447	4.34	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	9	32	69	4.52	510/1447	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	4	18	27	63	4.33	717/1241	4.26	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	35	0	1	12	21	43	4.38	645/1402	4.16	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	6	6	9	33	51	4.11	736/1358	4.01	4.09	4.11	4.10	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	44	0	3	10	18	36	4.30	581/1316	4.07	4.13	4.14	4.13	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	3	1	2	12	19	74	4.51	459/1427	4.29	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.51
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	1	0	1	7	99	4.88	565/1447	4.90	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	2	1	0	6	41	37	4.33	553/1434	4.24	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	4	19	84	4.72	475/1387	4.72	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	8	102	4.93	422/1387	4.81	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	6	26	76	4.65	457/1386	4.52	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	1	5	15	85	4.74	366/1380	4.53	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	11	24	70	4.56	249/1193	4.31	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	78	0	5	1	8	5	18	3.81	853/1172	3.95	4.14	4.15	4.24	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	77	0	4	3	7	9	15	3.74	1017/1182	3.90	4.29	4.35	4.42	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	77	0	3	0	4	13	18	4.13	833/1170	4.11	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	78	22	3	1	1	3	7	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	112	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 189	4.34	4.74	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	114	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	4.38	4.68	4.34	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	113	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	114	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	114	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	114	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	114	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	39	Required for Majors		86	Graduate	1	Major	54
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	0	B	36							
56-83	22	2.00-2.99	12	C	17	General		2	Under-grad	114	Non-major	61
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	18	D	0							
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives		2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		2				
				?	3							

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	4	7	34	56	69	4.05	1032/1447	4.34	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.05
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	11	30	48	79	4.14	956/1447	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	11	23	51	83	4.19	833/1241	4.26	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	5	6	7	38	52	61	3.95	1036/1402	4.16	4.27	4.24	4.24	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	11	6	12	33	45	61	3.91	905/1358	4.01	4.09	4.11	4.10	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	6	12	42	50	57	3.84	950/1316	4.07	4.13	4.14	4.13	3.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	6	13	22	49	78	4.07	931/1427	4.29	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	0	9	156	4.93	388/1447	4.90	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	39	2	1	1	18	69	43	4.15	744/1434	4.24	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	6	31	129	4.72	475/1387	4.72	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	2	8	29	127	4.69	946/1387	4.81	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	6	19	44	97	4.40	757/1386	4.52	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	6	3	17	44	95	4.33	823/1380	4.53	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	18	8	5	25	38	67	4.06	632/1193	4.31	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	118	0	4	0	12	10	29	4.09	675/1172	3.95	4.14	4.15	4.24	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	120	0	6	1	7	9	30	4.06	844/1182	3.90	4.29	4.35	4.42	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	120	0	5	0	8	12	28	4.09	852/1170	4.11	4.34	4.38	4.49	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	121	24	3	2	12	4	7	3.36	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	54	0	2	3	15	32	67	4.34	113/ 189	4.34	4.74	4.34	4.26	4.34
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	1	12	44	62	4.38	114/ 192	4.38	4.68	4.34	4.20	4.38
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	0	1	5	8	23	82	4.51	102/ 186	4.51	4.70	4.48	4.36	4.51
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	1	2	9	9	25	73	4.34	114/ 187	4.34	4.67	4.33	4.11	4.34
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	52	0	4	14	20	30	53	3.94	120/ 168	3.94	4.48	4.20	4.02	3.94
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	169	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	169	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	169	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	169	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	169	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	169	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	170	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	170	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	171	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	171	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	171	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	171	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	171	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	171	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	171	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****



Course-Section: BIOL 302 01  
 Title Mol & Gen Genetics Lab  
 Instructor: Caruso, Steven M  
 Enrollment: 193  
 Questionnaires: 173

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 176  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	58	Required for Majors 131	Graduate	0	Major 85
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	63				
56-83	33	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	Under-grad	173	Non-major 88
84-150	53	3.00-3.49	35	D	0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	43	F	0	Electives			
				P	0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				I	0	Other			
				?	11				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	5	14	39	45	4.14	971/1447	4.14	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	5	35	35	25	3.67	1262/1447	3.67	4.28	4.27	4.23	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	14	27	35	24	3.56	1126/1241	3.56	4.26	4.33	4.33	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	79	2	2	8	9	5	3.50	****/1402	****	4.27	4.24	4.24	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	12	7	27	22	30	3.52	1161/1358	3.52	4.09	4.11	4.10	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	87	2	5	5	1	3	2.88	****/1316	****	4.13	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	2	4	7	17	31	41	3.98	992/1427	3.98	4.22	4.19	4.15	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	1	0	0	4	95	4.92	388/1447	4.92	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	2	5	38	38	10	3.53	1228/1434	3.50	4.03	4.10	4.09	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	13	23	63	4.40	911/1387	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	3	9	20	71	4.54	1107/1387	4.61	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	7	24	33	33	3.83	1160/1386	3.88	4.28	4.32	4.30	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	8	18	30	40	3.91	1096/1380	3.97	4.38	4.32	4.32	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	5	11	17	26	32	3.76	843/1193	3.92	4.14	4.02	4.05	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	75	0	4	5	2	4	16	3.74	886/1172	3.74	4.14	4.15	4.24	3.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	78	0	5	1	4	8	10	3.61	1053/1182	3.61	4.29	4.35	4.42	3.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	78	0	8	2	4	4	10	3.21	1122/1170	3.21	4.34	4.38	4.49	3.21
4. Were special techniques successful	78	19	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	103	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.74	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	104	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	4.68	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	104	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.70	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	4.67	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.48	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	103	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	104	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	103	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	103	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	103	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	103	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	103	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	104	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	104	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	103	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	104	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 303 01  
 Title Cell Biology  
 Instructor: Craig, Nessly C (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 232  
 Questionnaires: 106

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 177  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	42	Required for Majors	87	Graduate	0	Major	48
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	29						
56-83	29	2.00-2.99	8	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	106	Non-major	58
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	22	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	37	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	6						

Course-Section: BIOL 303 01  
 Title Cell Biology  
 Instructor: Blumberg,Daphne (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 232  
 Questionnaires: 106

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 178  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	5	14	39	45	4.14	971/1447	4.14	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	5	35	35	25	3.67	1262/1447	3.67	4.28	4.27	4.23	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	14	27	35	24	3.56	1126/1241	3.56	4.26	4.33	4.33	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	79	2	2	8	9	5	3.50	****/1402	****	4.27	4.24	4.24	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	12	7	27	22	30	3.52	1161/1358	3.52	4.09	4.11	4.10	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	87	2	5	5	1	3	2.88	****/1316	****	4.13	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	2	4	7	17	31	41	3.98	992/1427	3.98	4.22	4.19	4.15	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	3	1	0	0	4	95	4.92	388/1447	4.92	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	2	9	36	34	11	3.47	1253/1434	3.50	4.03	4.10	4.09	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	3	12	24	56	4.40	902/1387	4.40	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	5	19	71	4.67	982/1387	4.61	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	3	5	20	35	32	3.93	1111/1386	3.88	4.28	4.32	4.30	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	4	7	13	30	41	4.02	1023/1380	3.97	4.38	4.32	4.32	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	2	3	5	13	28	39	4.08	624/1193	3.92	4.14	4.02	4.05	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	75	0	4	5	2	4	16	3.74	886/1172	3.74	4.14	4.15	4.24	3.74
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	78	0	5	1	4	8	10	3.61	1053/1182	3.61	4.29	4.35	4.42	3.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	78	0	8	2	4	4	10	3.21	1122/1170	3.21	4.34	4.38	4.49	3.21
4. Were special techniques successful	78	19	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	103	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.74	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	104	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 192	****	4.68	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	104	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.70	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	4.67	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 168	****	4.48	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	103	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	104	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	103	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	103	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	103	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	103	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	104	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	103	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	104	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	104	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	103	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	104	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 303 01  
 Title Cell Biology  
 Instructor: Blumberg, Daphne (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 232  
 Questionnaires: 106

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 178  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	42	Required for Majors	87	Graduate	0	Major	48
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	29						
56-83	29	2.00-2.99	8	C	15	General	0	Under-grad	106	Non-major	58
84-150	23	3.00-3.49	22	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	37	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	6						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	0	1	28	40	4.51	573/1447	4.51	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.51
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	0	1	14	49	4.69	315/1447	4.69	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	6	20	38	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	4	18	43	4.56	425/1402	4.56	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	12	15	37	4.35	507/1358	4.35	4.09	4.11	4.10	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	10	15	38	4.39	504/1316	4.39	4.13	4.14	4.13	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	1	1	1	3	17	40	4.52	446/1427	4.52	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	5	58	4.92	388/1447	4.92	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	0	21	44	4.68	222/1434	4.68	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	0	0	2	54	4.89	215/1387	4.89	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	6	51	4.89	553/1387	4.89	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	1	0	13	43	4.72	366/1386	4.72	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	14	43	4.69	434/1380	4.69	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	16	1	1	10	9	16	4.03	644/1193	4.03	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.03
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	****/1172	****	4.14	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	59	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	****/1182	****	4.29	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	60	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	****/1170	****	4.34	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	60	3	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	1	13	16	4.50	87/ 189	4.50	4.74	4.34	4.26	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	29/ 192	4.83	4.68	4.34	4.20	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	1	1	6	22	4.63	78/ 186	4.63	4.70	4.48	4.36	4.63
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	1	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	33/ 187	4.83	4.67	4.33	4.11	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	1	3	5	21	4.53	44/ 168	4.53	4.48	4.20	4.02	4.53
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	72	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	72	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	72	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	72	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 17	Required for Majors	44	Graduate 0	Major	42
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 27					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	1	Under-grad 73	Non-major	31
84-150	21	3.00-3.49 13	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
			P 0					
			I 0	Other	1			
			? 4					

Course-Section: BIOL 305 01  
 Title Comp. Animal Physiolog  
 Instructor: Lin, Weihong (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 261  
 Questionnaires: 100

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 180  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	1	0	10	32	49	4.39	732/1447	4.49	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	2	17	36	36	4.13	965/1447	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	1	4	17	34	36	4.09	887/1241	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	51	2	1	5	14	19	4.15	873/1402	4.23	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	3	3	4	18	25	38	4.03	783/1358	4.04	4.09	4.11	4.10	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	70	4	2	7	1	7	3.24	****/1316	4.04	4.13	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	1	1	10	22	57	4.46	513/1427	4.47	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	1	0	0	2	4	83	4.91	436/1447	4.93	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	7	14	36	24	1	2.98	1358/1434	3.86	4.03	4.10	4.09	3.65

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	2	2	10	22	54	4.38	931/1387	4.65	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	1	9	19	60	4.51	1134/1387	4.70	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	13	11	31	13	21	3.20	1306/1386	4.13	4.28	4.32	4.30	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	11	8	19	22	29	3.56	1229/1380	4.23	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.02
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	10	5	2	17	18	35	3.99	673/1193	4.31	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.16

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	85	0	1	2	3	3	6	3.73	****/1172	****	4.14	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	85	0	1	3	2	3	6	3.67	****/1182	****	4.29	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	85	0	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	****/1170	****	4.34	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	85	9	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 26	Required for Majors 73	Graduate 0 Major 64
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 31		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 5	C 9	General 0	Under-grad 100 Non-major 36
84-150	29	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 19	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 9		

Course-Section: BIOL 305 01  
 Title Comp. Animal Physiolog  
 Instructor: Lohr, Bernard (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 261  
 Questionnaires: 100

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 181  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	1	0	10	32	49	4.39	732/1447	4.49	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	1	2	17	36	36	4.13	965/1447	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	1	4	17	34	36	4.09	887/1241	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	51	2	1	5	14	19	4.15	873/1402	4.23	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	3	3	4	18	25	38	4.03	783/1358	4.04	4.09	4.11	4.10	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	70	4	2	7	1	7	3.24	****/1316	4.04	4.13	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	1	1	10	22	57	4.46	513/1427	4.47	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	1	0	0	2	4	83	4.91	436/1447	4.93	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	0	1	4	41	32	4.33	540/1434	3.86	4.03	4.10	4.09	3.65

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	1	1	1	15	66	4.71	490/1387	4.65	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	3	10	71	4.81	784/1387	4.70	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	1	5	19	58	4.57	539/1386	4.13	4.28	4.32	4.30	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	2	7	20	53	4.47	699/1380	4.23	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.02
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	12	1	1	12	15	40	4.33	420/1193	4.31	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.16

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	85	0	1	2	3	3	6	3.73	****/1172	****	4.14	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	85	0	1	3	2	3	6	3.67	****/1182	****	4.29	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	85	0	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	****/1170	****	4.34	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	85	9	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 26	Required for Majors 73	Graduate 0 Major 64
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 31		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 5	C 9	General 0	Under-grad 100 Non-major 36
84-150	29	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 19	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 9		



Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	15	43	4.68	386/1447	4.49	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	14	43	4.67	352/1447	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	5	10	42	4.56	496/1241	4.24	4.26	4.33	4.33	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	10	40	4.40	616/1402	4.23	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	9	1	2	11	13	21	4.06	767/1358	4.04	4.09	4.11	4.10	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	2	3	12	12	26	4.04	795/1316	4.04	4.13	4.14	4.13	4.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	7	11	39	4.50	459/1427	4.47	4.22	4.19	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	56	4.98	97/1447	4.93	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	1	0	2	28	18	4.27	623/1434	3.86	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	7	46	4.87	261/1387	4.65	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	1	6	45	4.77	829/1387	4.70	4.70	4.73	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	4	12	37	4.62	483/1386	4.13	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	0	0	14	38	4.66	463/1380	4.23	4.38	4.32	4.32	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	2	0	1	10	37	4.60	224/1193	4.31	4.14	4.02	4.05	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/1172	****	4.14	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	54	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/1182	****	4.29	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	54	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/1170	****	4.34	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	54	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.12	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	1	0	1	0	3	27	4.81	36/ 189	4.81	4.74	4.34	4.26	4.81
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	1	4	26	4.69	56/ 192	4.69	4.68	4.34	4.20	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	1	0	0	1	3	27	4.84	36/ 186	4.84	4.70	4.48	4.36	4.84
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	1	0	1	1	6	23	4.65	78/ 187	4.65	4.67	4.33	4.11	4.65
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	1	0	0	3	10	18	4.48	50/ 168	4.48	4.48	4.20	4.02	4.48
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 305 01  
 Title Comp Animal Physio. La  
 Instructor: Lake, Reagan A  
 Enrollment: 119  
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 182  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	36	Required for Majors	49	Graduate	0	Major	53
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	60	Non-major	7
84-150	24	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 395 1  
 Title MARC U\*STAR Writ in Sc  
 Instructor: Farabaugh,Robin  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 183  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.23	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	494/1402	4.75	4.27	4.24	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	799/1358	2.50	4.09	4.11	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.13	4.14	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.25	4.22	4.19	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.75	4.48	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.75	4.28	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1087/1193	3.00	4.14	4.02	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.14	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.29	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.20	4.06	4.12	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 395 2  
 Title MARC U\*STAR Writ in Sc  
 Instructor: Farabaugh,Robin  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 184  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	532/1447	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.23	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.75	4.27	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1358/1358	2.50	4.09	4.11	4.10	1.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.13	4.14	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1259/1427	4.25	4.22	4.19	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.03	4.10	4.09	4.50
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	798/1387	4.75	4.48	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	607/1386	4.75	4.28	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.32	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 414 01  
 Title Eukaryotics Gen/Mol Bi  
 Instructor: Lindahl,Lasse A (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 185  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	12	8	4.08	1017/1447	4.08	4.48	4.31	4.43	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	13	4	3.83	1189/1447	3.83	4.28	4.27	4.31	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	8	9	6	3.83	1034/1241	3.83	4.26	4.33	4.41	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	12	7	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	12	7	4.00	799/1358	4.00	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	10	8	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	4	10	8	4.04	948/1427	4.04	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	243/1447	4.96	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	6	9	5	3.81	1052/1434	3.93	4.03	4.10	4.17	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	6	11	4	3.67	1282/1387	3.83	4.48	4.46	4.48	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	1107/1387	4.54	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	8	9	5	3.67	1220/1386	3.79	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	11	7	3.83	1138/1380	4.02	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.02
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	9	10	4.22	509/1193	4.30	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	801/1172	3.91	4.14	4.15	4.25	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	292/1182	4.82	4.29	4.35	4.49	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	751/1170	4.27	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	537/ 800	3.86	4.20	4.06	4.19	3.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 10 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 414 01  
 Title Eukaryotics Gen/Mol Bi  
 Instructor: Zengel,Janice M (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 186  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	12	8	4.08	1017/1447	4.08	4.48	4.31	4.43	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	13	4	3.83	1189/1447	3.83	4.28	4.27	4.31	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	8	9	6	3.83	1034/1241	3.83	4.26	4.33	4.41	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	12	7	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	12	7	4.00	799/1358	4.00	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	10	8	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	4	10	8	4.04	948/1427	4.04	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	243/1447	4.96	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	8	7	4.05	828/1434	3.93	4.03	4.10	4.17	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	8	8	8	4.00	1176/1387	3.83	4.48	4.46	4.48	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	1107/1387	4.54	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	10	7	3.92	1119/1386	3.79	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	9	11	4.21	934/1380	4.02	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.02
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	382/1193	4.30	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	801/1172	3.91	4.14	4.15	4.25	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	292/1182	4.82	4.29	4.35	4.49	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	751/1170	4.27	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	537/ 800	3.86	4.20	4.06	4.19	3.86

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 10 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 15 Non-major 17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: BIOL 420 1  
 Title Adv Topics:Cell Biolog  
 Instructor: McGraw,Patricia  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 187  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	5	4	4	3	2.85	1429/1447	2.85	4.48	4.31	4.43	2.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	5	7	2	3	2.85	1414/1447	2.85	4.28	4.27	4.31	2.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	8	5	3.80	1054/1241	3.80	4.26	4.33	4.41	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	7	3	3.42	1281/1402	3.42	4.27	4.24	4.34	3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	4	2	3	3	5	3.18	1268/1358	3.18	4.09	4.11	4.15	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1230/1316	3.22	4.13	4.14	4.27	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	8	2	2	3	4	2.63	1392/1427	2.63	4.22	4.19	4.20	2.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	11	8	0	1	0	1.55	1447/1447	1.55	4.75	4.69	4.72	1.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	9	1	4	0	2	2.06	1424/1434	2.06	4.03	4.10	4.17	2.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	6	2	4	1	4	2.71	1367/1387	2.71	4.48	4.46	4.48	2.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	6	3	8	3.94	1332/1387	3.94	4.70	4.73	4.76	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	6	1	5	3.11	1321/1386	3.11	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	3	6	1	4	2.89	1329/1380	2.89	4.38	4.32	4.34	2.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	3	2	3	3	4	3.20	1050/1193	3.20	4.14	4.02	4.00	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1127/1172	2.83	4.14	4.15	4.25	2.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1166/1182	2.67	4.29	4.35	4.49	2.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	1148/1170	2.83	4.34	4.38	4.51	2.83
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 20 Non-major 13
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 4		

Course-Section: BIOL 428 1  
 Title Computer Appl Molec Bi  
 Instructor: Oneill,Michael  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 188  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1238/1447	3.80	4.48	4.31	4.43	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1350/1447	3.40	4.28	4.27	4.31	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1215/1241	3.00	4.26	4.33	4.41	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1384/1402	2.75	4.27	4.24	4.34	2.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1344/1358	2.33	4.09	4.11	4.15	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1299/1316	2.50	4.13	4.14	4.27	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	154/1427	4.80	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1150/1434	3.67	4.03	4.10	4.17	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1362/1387	2.80	4.48	4.46	4.48	2.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1320/1387	4.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	1345/1386	2.80	4.28	4.32	4.34	2.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1297/1380	3.25	4.38	4.32	4.34	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	4.14	4.15	4.25	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1037/1182	3.67	4.29	4.35	4.49	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	480/1170	4.67	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.19	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	4.74	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.68	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	4.70	4.48	4.72	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.67	4.33	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 168	****	4.48	4.20	4.53	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.55	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****



Course-Section: BIOL 428 1  
 Title Computer Appl Molec Bi  
 Instructor: Oneill,Michael  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 188  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 430 1  
 Title Biological Chemistry  
 Instructor: McGraw, Patricia Gluick, Tom  
 Enrollment: 111  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 189  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1339/1447	3.50	4.48	4.31	4.43	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1361/1447	3.33	4.28	4.27	4.31	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1143/1241	3.50	4.26	4.33	4.41	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1231/1358	3.33	4.09	4.11	4.15	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1316	****	4.13	4.14	4.27	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	1347/1427	3.17	4.22	4.19	4.20	3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1426/1447	3.67	4.75	4.69	4.72	3.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	0	2	0	2.60	1399/1434	2.60	4.03	4.10	4.17	2.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	3.17	1340/1387	3.17	4.48	4.46	4.48	3.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1353/1387	3.67	4.70	4.73	4.76	3.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1220/1386	3.67	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1198/1380	3.67	4.38	4.32	4.34	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	999/1193	3.40	4.14	4.02	4.00	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	999/1172	3.50	4.14	4.15	4.25	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.29	4.35	4.49	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 434 1  
 Title Microbial Molec Geneti  
 Instructor: Wolf JR,Richard  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 190  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	820/1447	4.30	4.48	4.31	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	479/1447	4.55	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.26	4.33	4.41	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	8	9	4.20	827/1402	4.20	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	312/1358	4.55	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1097/1316	3.58	4.13	4.14	4.27	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	337/1427	4.60	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	14	5	4.20	1286/1447	4.20	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	230/1434	4.67	4.03	4.10	4.17	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	276/1387	4.85	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	793/1386	4.35	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	477/1380	4.65	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	7	5	7	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	445/1172	4.43	4.14	4.15	4.25	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	158/1182	4.93	4.29	4.35	4.49	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	640/1170	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	655/ 800	3.50	4.20	4.06	4.19	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.74	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.68	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.70	4.48	4.72	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.67	4.33	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	4.48	4.20	4.53	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.87	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.80	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	4.43	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.68	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	4.42	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.60	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 434 1  
 Title Microbial Molec Geneti  
 Instructor: Wolf JR, Richard  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 190  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	9	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 443 1  
 Title Adv Topics:Devel Biolo  
 Instructor: Starz-Gaiano,Mi (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 191  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	353/1447	4.71	4.48	4.31	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	413/1447	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.26	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	207/1402	4.76	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	201/1358	4.71	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	292/1316	4.60	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	3	13	4.14	882/1427	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	478/1434	4.44	4.03	4.10	4.17	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	291/1387	4.82	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	317/1387	4.98	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	558/1386	4.63	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	582/1380	4.61	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	174/1193	4.72	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	163/1172	4.83	4.14	4.15	4.25	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.83	4.29	4.35	4.49	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	640/1170	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.20	4.06	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 3	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 19	Non-major 12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: BIOL 443 1  
 Title Adv Topics:Devel Biolo  
 Instructor: Brewster,Rachel (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 192  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	353/1447	4.71	4.48	4.31	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	413/1447	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.26	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	207/1402	4.76	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	201/1358	4.71	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	292/1316	4.60	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	2	3	13	4.14	882/1427	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.20	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	341/1434	4.44	4.03	4.10	4.17	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	353/1387	4.82	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1387	4.98	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	392/1386	4.63	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	477/1380	4.61	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	131/1193	4.72	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	163/1172	4.83	4.14	4.15	4.25	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.83	4.29	4.35	4.49	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	640/1170	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.20	4.06	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 3	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 19	Non-major 12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: BIOL 456 1  
 Title Plant Molecular Biolog  
 Instructor: Lu,Hua  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 193  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	2	3	6	3.67	1290/1447	3.67	4.48	4.31	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	1	6	3.60	1286/1447	3.60	4.28	4.27	4.31	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	975/1241	3.93	4.26	4.33	4.41	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	1101/1402	3.87	4.27	4.24	4.34	3.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	2	7	3.73	1036/1358	3.73	4.09	4.11	4.15	3.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	933/1316	3.87	4.13	4.14	4.27	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	3	4	3.53	1249/1427	3.53	4.22	4.19	4.20	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	339/1447	4.93	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1181/1434	3.62	4.03	4.10	4.17	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	1055/1387	4.23	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1042/1387	4.62	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	0	5	5	3.92	1111/1386	3.92	4.28	4.32	4.34	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	2	1	6	3.69	1188/1380	3.69	4.38	4.32	4.34	3.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	564/1193	4.15	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	339/1172	4.57	4.14	4.15	4.25	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	621/1182	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.49	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	440/1170	4.71	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	380/ 800	4.17	4.20	4.06	4.19	4.17

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 457 1  
 Title Phys:Marine/Est Animal  
 Instructor: Cronin,Thomas W  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 194  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	148/1447	4.90	4.48	4.31	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	315/1447	4.70	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	345/1241	4.70	4.26	4.33	4.41	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	931/1358	3.89	4.09	4.11	4.15	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	671/1316	4.20	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	1077/1427	3.90	4.22	4.19	4.20	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	578/1434	4.30	4.03	4.10	4.17	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	253/1386	4.80	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	273/1380	4.80	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	168/1193	4.70	4.14	4.02	4.00	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	521/1172	4.33	4.14	4.15	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.29	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 800	****	4.20	4.06	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: BIOL 486 01  
 Title Genome Science  
 Instructor: Bustos,Mauricio  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 195  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	474/1447	4.60	4.48	4.31	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	911/1447	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	827/1241	4.20	4.26	4.33	4.41	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	616/1402	4.40	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1358	4.80	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1144/1427	3.80	4.22	4.19	4.20	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.03	4.10	4.17	4.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1176/1387	4.00	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	784/1387	4.80	4.70	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	940/1380	4.20	4.38	4.32	4.34	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	843/1193	3.75	4.14	4.02	4.00	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 495 1  
 Title Seminar Bioinformatics  
 Instructor: Kann,Maricel Ga (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 196  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.41	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	4.83	4.27	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	4.75	4.13	4.14	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.22	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.03	4.10	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	431/1386	4.79	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.14	4.02	4.00	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.14	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.29	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.20	4.06	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 495 1  
 Title Seminar Bioinformatics  
 Instructor: Erill Sagales,I (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 197  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.41	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	4.83	4.27	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	4.75	4.13	4.14	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.22	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.03	4.10	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	607/1386	4.79	4.28	4.32	4.34	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.14	4.02	4.00	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.14	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.29	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.20	4.06	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 495 2  
 Title Seminar Bioinformatics  
 Instructor: Kann,Maricel Ga (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 198  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.41	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	314/1402	4.83	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	392/1316	4.75	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.22	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.03	4.10	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.79	4.28	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.14	4.02	4.00	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.14	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.29	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.20	4.06	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 495 2  
 Title Seminar Bioinformatics  
 Instructor: Erill Sagales,I (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 199  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.41	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	314/1402	4.83	4.27	4.24	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.09	4.11	4.15	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	392/1316	4.75	4.13	4.14	4.27	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.22	4.19	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.75	4.69	4.72	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.03	4.10	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.79	4.28	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.14	4.02	4.00	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.14	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.29	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.20	4.06	4.19	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 636 1  
 Title Adv Molec Biol Lab II  
 Instructor: Wolf,Julia B  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 200  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	254/1447	4.90	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	426/1447	4.80	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	231/1241	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.38	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	380/1402	4.80	4.27	4.24	4.29	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	173/1358	4.88	4.09	4.11	4.26	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	997/1316	4.38	4.13	4.14	4.34	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	596/1427	4.70	4.22	4.19	4.25	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1155/1447	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.74	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1188/1434	4.30	4.03	4.10	4.21	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	798/1387	4.75	4.48	4.46	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1260/1387	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.81	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1386	4.88	4.28	4.32	4.43	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	659/1380	4.75	4.38	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	843/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.02	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.25	4.14	4.15	4.32	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1078/1182	3.75	4.29	4.35	4.46	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1070/1170	4.25	4.34	4.38	4.52	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 189	5.00	4.74	4.34	4.82	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 192	5.00	4.68	4.34	4.79	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 186	5.00	4.70	4.48	4.73	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	98/ 187	4.75	4.67	4.33	4.67	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	17/ 168	4.88	4.48	4.20	4.55	4.75
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.85	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.59	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 636 2  
 Title Adv Molec Biol Lab II  
 Instructor: Wolf,Julia B  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 201  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.90	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.80	4.28	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	923/1241	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.80	4.27	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.09	4.11	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	4.38	4.13	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.70	4.22	4.19	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.70	4.75	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.30	4.03	4.10	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.75	4.48	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.28	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.75	4.38	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	652/1193	3.88	4.14	4.02	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	710/1172	4.25	4.14	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	856/1182	3.75	4.29	4.35	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	4.25	4.34	4.38	4.52	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 189	5.00	4.74	4.34	4.82	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 192	5.00	4.68	4.34	4.79	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 186	5.00	4.70	4.48	4.73	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 187	4.75	4.67	4.33	4.67	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 168	4.88	4.48	4.20	4.55	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 656 1  
 Title Plant Molecular Biolog  
 Instructor: Lu,Hua  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 202  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	685/1402	4.33	4.27	4.24	4.29	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	529/1358	4.33	4.09	4.11	4.26	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.13	4.14	4.34	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.03	4.10	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	970/1387	4.33	4.48	4.46	4.51	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.38	4.32	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.14	4.02	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.14	4.15	4.32	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.29	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.20	4.06	4.10	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: BIOL 750 01  
 Title Organismic Biology  
 Instructor: Lin, Weihong  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 203  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	254/1447	4.80	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	911/1447	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.26	4.33	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.27	4.24	4.29	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1358	4.80	4.09	4.11	4.26	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	128/1316	4.80	4.13	4.14	4.34	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1155/1447	4.40	4.75	4.69	4.74	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.03	4.10	4.21	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.48	4.46	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.70	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.38	4.32	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.14	4.02	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1172	4.80	4.14	4.15	4.32	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1182	4.80	4.29	4.35	4.46	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	581/ 800	3.75	4.20	4.06	4.10	3.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	58/ 66	4.00	4.00	4.58	4.71	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	53/ 62	4.00	4.00	4.56	4.69	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	33/ 58	4.50	4.50	4.41	4.75	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	37/ 65	4.50	4.50	4.42	4.64	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	54/ 64	3.50	3.50	4.09	4.18	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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