

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL
 Enrollment: 301
 Questionnaires: 273

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 124
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	17	17	65	85	88	3.77	1257/1504	3.77	4.39	4.27	4.13	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	12	15	56	104	85	3.86	1154/1503	3.86	4.23	4.20	4.16	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	16	20	44	83	108	3.91	1013/1290	3.91	4.18	4.28	4.19	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	52	28	23	64	64	39	3.29	1359/1453	3.29	4.08	4.21	4.11	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	13	10	46	79	113	4.03	725/1421	4.03	3.99	4.00	3.91	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	57	47	37	43	44	39	2.96	1306/1365	2.96	3.88	4.08	3.96	2.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	3	20	33	62	68	82	3.60	1246/1485	3.60	4.14	4.16	4.13	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	1	0	1	5	262	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.90	4.69	4.66	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	44	2	23	24	70	82	28	3.30	1316/1483	3.30	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	7	8	27	65	159	4.36	951/1425	4.36	4.47	4.41	4.36	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	5	4	23	42	193	4.55	1089/1426	4.55	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	15	29	56	94	73	3.68	1197/1418	3.68	4.28	4.25	4.20	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	2	32	35	47	71	82	3.51	1248/1416	3.51	4.32	4.26	4.21	3.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	27	23	59	69	86	3.62	876/1199	3.62	4.13	3.97	3.82	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	31	17	51	62	96	3.68	937/1312	3.68	4.09	4.00	3.69	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	4	15	28	67	143	4.28	776/1303	4.28	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	8	12	34	77	125	4.17	855/1299	4.17	4.29	4.25	3.94	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	18	11	21	15	49	62	97	3.82	493/ 758	3.82	3.90	4.01	3.80	3.82
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	261	5	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	264	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	263	3	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	262	3	1	2	0	1	4	3.63	****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	263	5	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	262	4	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	264	4	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	264	6	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	264	0	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	264	1	2	2	1	1	2	2.88	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	266	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	266	0	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	267	1	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	266	3	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	265	5	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	265	0	1	1	3	0	3	3.38	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	264	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	264	3	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	265	1	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	265	1	2	0	1	1	3	3.43	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 100 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL
 Enrollment: 301
 Questionnaires: 273

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 124
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	103	0.00-0.99	4	A	93	Required for Majors	30	Graduate	0	Major	72
28-55	61	1.00-1.99	2	B	86						
56-83	16	2.00-2.99	37	C	70	General	8	Under-grad	273	Non-major	201
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	57	D	7						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	70	F	2	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	213				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: SOKOLOVE, PHILL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 125
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	609/1504	4.46	4.39	4.27	4.13	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	1	4	3.62	1267/1503	3.62	4.23	4.20	4.16	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	4	1	2	2	3.00	1236/1290	3.00	4.18	4.28	4.19	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	4	1	4	3.45	1307/1453	3.45	4.08	4.21	4.11	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	3	8	4.15	633/1421	4.15	3.99	4.00	3.91	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	3.88	4.08	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	6	2	2	1	2.67	1440/1485	2.67	4.14	4.16	4.13	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	525/1504	4.92	4.90	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1483	3.50	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	3.83	4.47	4.41	4.36	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1418	3.67	4.28	4.25	4.20	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1416	4.00	4.32	4.26	4.21	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1199	****	4.13	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	4	5	3.83	858/1312	3.83	4.09	4.00	3.69	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	0	1	9	4.33	737/1303	4.33	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.29	4.25	3.94	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	722/ 758	2.75	3.90	4.01	3.80	2.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	0	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100H 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOL-HONOR
 Instructor: KLOETZEL, JOHN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 126
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	609/1504	4.46	4.39	4.27	4.13	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	1	4	3.62	1267/1503	3.62	4.23	4.20	4.16	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	4	1	2	2	3.00	1236/1290	3.00	4.18	4.28	4.19	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	4	1	4	3.45	1307/1453	3.45	4.08	4.21	4.11	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	3	8	4.15	633/1421	4.15	3.99	4.00	3.91	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	3.88	4.08	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	6	2	2	1	2.67	1440/1485	2.67	4.14	4.16	4.13	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	525/1504	4.92	4.90	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	3	2	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1238/1425	3.83	4.47	4.41	4.36	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1201/1418	3.67	4.28	4.25	4.20	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.32	4.26	4.21	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1199	****	4.13	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	4	5	3.83	858/1312	3.83	4.09	4.00	3.69	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	0	1	9	4.33	737/1303	4.33	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.29	4.25	3.94	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	722/ 758	2.75	3.90	4.01	3.80	2.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10
84-150	0	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 175
 Questionnaires: 159

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 127
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	8	15	26	60	48	3.80	1248/1504	3.80	4.39	4.27	4.13	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	3	23	75	53	4.10	996/1503	4.10	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	13	29	55	57	3.94	996/1290	3.94	4.18	4.28	4.19	3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	10	33	59	53	3.98	1021/1453	3.98	4.08	4.21	4.11	3.98
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	5	7	24	37	79	4.17	614/1421	4.17	3.99	4.00	3.91	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	13	14	27	54	47	3.70	1046/1365	3.70	3.88	4.08	3.96	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	13	26	44	70	4.08	953/1485	4.08	4.14	4.16	4.13	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	24	131	4.85	760/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.66	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	3	6	6	64	47	6	3.32	1310/1483	3.32	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	27	55	70	4.23	1050/1425	4.23	4.47	4.41	4.36	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	12	36	60	46	3.89	1346/1426	3.89	4.67	4.69	4.56	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	6	35	67	44	3.96	1047/1418	3.96	4.28	4.25	4.20	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	12	13	19	32	35	42	3.52	1241/1416	3.52	4.32	4.26	4.21	3.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	9	16	42	39	39	3.57	894/1199	3.57	4.13	3.97	3.82	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	75	0	11	9	19	20	25	3.46	1027/1312	3.46	4.09	4.00	3.69	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	79	0	11	10	19	20	20	3.35	1149/1303	3.35	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	80	0	14	12	16	19	18	3.19	1177/1299	3.19	4.29	4.25	3.94	3.19
4. Were special techniques successful	80	33	5	8	9	13	11	3.37	623/ 758	3.37	3.90	4.01	3.80	3.37
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	2	4	10	49	73	4.36	98/ 233	4.36	4.59	4.09	3.90	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	2	3	6	36	91	4.53	79/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.07	4.53
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	1	1	4	26	106	4.70	70/ 227	4.70	4.74	4.40	4.24	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	14	33	89	4.55	97/ 225	4.55	4.71	4.23	4.01	4.55
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	3	4	17	30	84	4.36	75/ 207	4.36	4.50	4.09	4.01	4.36
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	144	2	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	144	5	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	145	5	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	145	4	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	146	3	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	150	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	149	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	148	3	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	150	4	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	151	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	148	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	147	2	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	148	4	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	148	1	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	148	1	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 100L 0101
 Title CONCEPTS OF BIOLOGY LA
 Instructor: CLAASSEN, LARK
 Enrollment: 175
 Questionnaires: 159

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 127
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	55	0.00-0.99	1	A	75	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	76
28-55	44	1.00-1.99	0	B	61						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	21	C	10	General	1	Under-grad	159	Non-major	83
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	39	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	55	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	133				
				?	4						

Course-Section: BIOL 106 0101
 Title THE HUMAN ORGANISM
 Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E
 Enrollment: 125
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 128
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	8	3	15	20	16	3.53	1343/1504	3.53	4.39	4.27	4.13	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	9	17	21	11	3.42	1344/1503	3.42	4.23	4.20	4.16	3.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	8	10	22	17	3.61	1127/1290	3.61	4.18	4.28	4.19	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	41	3	3	5	5	5	3.29	1359/1453	3.29	4.08	4.21	4.11	3.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	2	5	10	13	25	3.98	768/1421	3.98	3.99	4.00	3.91	3.98
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	45	8	1	1	3	3	2.50	1347/1365	2.50	3.88	4.08	3.96	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	4	3	6	16	30	4.10	938/1485	4.10	4.14	4.16	4.13	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	4	56	4.93	460/1504	4.93	4.90	4.69	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	5	4	21	16	6	3.27	1324/1483	3.27	4.05	4.06	3.97	3.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	6	17	34	4.35	951/1425	4.35	4.47	4.41	4.36	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	8	16	36	4.43	1183/1426	4.43	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	8	8	19	21	3.75	1163/1418	3.75	4.28	4.25	4.20	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	3	6	13	12	25	3.85	1126/1416	3.85	4.32	4.26	4.21	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	4	4	16	15	22	3.77	810/1199	3.77	4.13	3.97	3.82	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	9	3	9	6	5	2.84	1194/1312	2.84	4.09	4.00	3.69	2.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	4	3	11	3	11	3.44	1133/1303	3.44	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	6	1	9	3	13	3.50	1106/1299	3.50	4.29	4.25	3.94	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	32	22	1	4	2	0	3	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	61	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	61	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	62	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 106 0101
 Title THE HUMAN ORGANISM
 Instructor: HANSON, FRANK E
 Enrollment: 125
 Questionnaires: 64

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 128
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	45	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	2	B	15						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	7	C	22	General	4	Under-grad	64	Non-major	64
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	D	4						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	3	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	3						

Course-Section: BIOL 106H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: HANSON, FRANK
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 129
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.23	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.18	4.28	4.19	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	320/1421	4.50	3.99	4.00	3.91	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.88	4.08	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.14	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.47	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.28	4.25	4.20	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.32	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.13	3.97	3.82	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.09	4.00	3.69	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.29	4.25	3.94	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	3.90	4.01	3.80	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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 123 0101
 Title HUMAN GENETICS
 Instructor: GETHMANN, RICHA
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 130
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	3	12	18	4.31	813/1504	4.31	4.39	4.27	4.13	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	0	4	13	17	4.29	816/1503	4.29	4.23	4.20	4.16	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	9	22	4.49	534/1290	4.49	4.18	4.28	4.19	4.49
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	9	2	0	0	10	14	4.31	718/1453	4.31	4.08	4.21	4.11	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	6	3	1	6	6	13	3.86	895/1421	3.86	3.99	4.00	3.91	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	7	1	5	4	10	8	3.68	1059/1365	3.68	3.88	4.08	3.96	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	2	11	21	4.56	402/1485	4.56	4.14	4.16	4.13	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	5	10	13	4.29	602/1483	4.29	4.05	4.06	3.97	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	7	27	4.69	525/1425	4.69	4.47	4.41	4.36	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	32	4.86	596/1426	4.86	4.67	4.69	4.56	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	9	22	4.44	656/1418	4.44	4.28	4.25	4.20	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	4	27	4.58	544/1416	4.58	4.32	4.26	4.21	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	17	1	1	4	2	9	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.13	3.97	3.82	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	2	4	13	4.29	572/1312	4.29	4.09	4.00	3.69	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	523/1303	4.57	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	1	0	7	13	4.52	556/1299	4.52	4.29	4.25	3.94	4.52
4. Were special techniques successful	18	15	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	10	Under-grad	39	Non-major	38
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 252 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOLOGY I
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 93
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 131
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	1	6	55	4.87	153/1504	4.87	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	5	14	42	4.61	380/1503	4.61	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	7	13	42	4.56	450/1290	4.56	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	7	2	6	10	18	17	3.79	1172/1453	3.79	4.08	4.21	4.20	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	7	1	1	5	19	27	4.32	489/1421	4.32	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	3	11	2	17	15	14	3.32	1229/1365	3.32	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	2	2	14	44	4.61	339/1485	4.61	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	48	14	4.23	1294/1504	4.23	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	0	25	27	4.52	330/1483	4.52	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	6	13	43	4.60	676/1425	4.60	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	61	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	7	18	37	4.48	604/1418	4.48	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	8	53	4.84	221/1416	4.84	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	17	0	0	7	9	29	4.49	290/1199	4.49	4.13	3.97	3.95	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	51	0	2	0	3	5	7	3.88	826/1312	3.88	4.09	4.00	3.98	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	50	0	2	1	1	2	12	4.17	851/1303	4.17	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	50	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.21	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	49	14	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	66	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	66	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	66	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	66	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	67	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	1	Major	8
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 36					

56-83	18	2.00-2.99	10	C	6	General	4	Under-grad	67	Non-major	60
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	20	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	53				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 132
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	455/1504	4.75	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	258/1503	4.66	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	290/1290	4.69	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	0	8	4.00	1001/1453	4.21	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	320/1421	4.65	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	2	5	3.43	1191/1365	3.74	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	170/1485	4.65	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	525/1504	4.91	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	250/1483	4.07	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	331/1425	4.58	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	502/1426	4.44	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	191/1418	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1416	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	636/1199	4.18	4.13	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1312	4.56	4.09	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1303	4.81	4.39	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1299	4.35	4.29	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	4.80	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	51/ 233	4.82	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	58/ 244	4.83	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	57/ 227	4.85	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	70/ 225	4.80	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 207	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0101
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 133
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	455/1504	4.75	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	258/1503	4.66	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	290/1290	4.69	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	0	8	4.00	1001/1453	4.21	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	320/1421	4.65	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	2	5	3.43	1191/1365	3.74	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	170/1485	4.65	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	525/1504	4.91	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	8	2	0	3.20	1340/1483	4.07	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1267/1425	4.58	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1356/1426	4.44	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1250/1418	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1309/1416	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1199	4.18	4.13	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1312	4.56	4.09	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1303	4.81	4.39	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1299	4.35	4.29	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	4.80	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	51/ 233	4.82	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.64
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	58/ 244	4.83	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.64
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	57/ 227	4.85	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	70/ 225	4.80	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.73
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 207	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0201
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 134
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	4.75	4.39	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	145/1503	4.66	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	173/1290	4.69	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	152/1453	4.21	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	112/1421	4.65	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	6	4.08	742/1365	3.74	3.88	4.08	4.00	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	78/1485	4.65	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	525/1504	4.91	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	635/1483	4.07	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	209/1425	4.58	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.44	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	233/1418	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	296/1416	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1199	4.18	4.13	3.97	3.95	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1312	4.56	4.09	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	4.81	4.39	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	4.35	4.29	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	4.80	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 233	4.82	4.59	4.09	4.30	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 244	4.83	4.62	4.09	4.24	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 227	4.85	4.74	4.40	4.58	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 225	4.80	4.71	4.23	4.52	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 207	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0301
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 135
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	306/1504	4.75	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	414/1503	4.66	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	290/1290	4.69	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	12	4.27	752/1453	4.21	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	182/1421	4.65	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	9	3	8	3.86	935/1365	3.74	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	339/1485	4.65	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1504	4.91	4.90	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	7	9	4.14	762/1483	4.07	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	541/1425	4.58	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1313/1426	4.44	4.67	4.69	4.71	3.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	964/1418	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	871/1416	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	9	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	574/1199	4.18	4.13	3.97	3.95	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	364/1312	4.56	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	4.81	4.39	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.35	4.29	4.25	4.21	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 758	4.80	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	31/ 233	4.82	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	23/ 244	4.83	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.87
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	64/ 227	4.85	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	81/ 225	4.80	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	9	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 207	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0301
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 136
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	306/1504	4.75	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	414/1503	4.66	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	290/1290	4.69	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	12	4.27	752/1453	4.21	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	182/1421	4.65	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	9	3	8	3.86	935/1365	3.74	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	339/1485	4.65	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1504	4.91	4.90	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	7	5	4	3.81	1082/1483	4.07	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	688/1425	4.58	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1339/1426	4.44	4.67	4.69	4.71	3.99
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1081/1418	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.02
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	1162/1416	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.01
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	7	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1199	4.18	4.13	3.97	3.95	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	364/1312	4.56	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	4.81	4.39	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.35	4.29	4.25	4.21	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 758	4.80	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	31/ 233	4.82	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.80
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	23/ 244	4.83	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.87
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	64/ 227	4.85	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	81/ 225	4.80	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	9	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 207	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0401
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: FLEISCHMANN, ES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 137
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	168/1504	4.75	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	380/1503	4.66	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	459/1290	4.69	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	9	4.05	974/1453	4.21	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	229/1421	4.65	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	6	6	3.75	1003/1365	3.74	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	563/1485	4.65	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	830/1504	4.91	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	12	4	4.18	720/1483	4.07	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.24

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	474/1425	4.58	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	1036/1426	4.44	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	514/1418	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	296/1416	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	748/1199	4.18	4.13	3.97	3.95	3.87

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	283/1312	4.56	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	488/1303	4.81	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1008/1299	4.35	4.29	4.25	4.21	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	84/ 758	4.80	3.90	4.01	3.89	4.80

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	23/ 233	4.82	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	18/ 244	4.83	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	37/ 227	4.85	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	33/ 225	4.80	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 207	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.22	5.00

Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****

Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8		0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	20
					Major 0
					Non-major 20

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P	0			
				I	0	Other	17	
				?	1			

Course-Section: BIOL 252L 0401
 Title ANATOMY & PHYSIOL LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 138
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	17	4.85	168/1504	4.75	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	380/1503	4.66	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	459/1290	4.69	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	9	4.05	974/1453	4.21	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	229/1421	4.65	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	6	6	3.75	1003/1365	3.74	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	563/1485	4.65	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	830/1504	4.91	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	567/1483	4.07	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	525/1425	4.58	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	643/1426	4.44	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	727/1418	4.30	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	407/1416	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	780/1199	4.18	4.13	3.97	3.95	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	283/1312	4.56	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	488/1303	4.81	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1008/1299	4.35	4.29	4.25	4.21	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	84/ 758	4.80	3.90	4.01	3.89	4.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	23/ 233	4.82	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.92
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	18/ 244	4.83	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.92
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	37/ 227	4.85	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.92
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	33/ 225	4.80	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 207	5.00	4.50	4.09	4.22	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
					Major 0
					Non-major 20

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P	0			
				I	0	Other	17	
				?	1			

Course-Section: BIOL 275 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 166
 Questionnaires: 73

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 139
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	11	30	26	4.10	1052/1504	4.10	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	6	19	35	11	3.72	1226/1503	3.72	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	8	25	28	10	3.56	1140/1290	3.56	4.18	4.28	4.27	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	50	0	3	6	6	6	3.71	1209/1453	3.71	4.08	4.21	4.20	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	6	12	22	15	12	3.22	1249/1421	3.22	3.99	4.00	3.90	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	56	0	2	5	4	3	3.57	****/1365	****	3.88	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	3	13	19	32	4.06	964/1485	4.06	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	65	4.93	525/1504	4.93	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	3	16	31	13	3.81	1082/1483	3.75	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	12	26	31	4.17	1094/1425	4.41	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	13	54	4.69	926/1426	4.73	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	8	17	28	16	3.68	1197/1418	3.92	4.28	4.25	4.22	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	5	9	22	35	4.23	896/1416	4.34	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	6	13	25	22	3.87	766/1199	3.94	4.13	3.97	3.95	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	54	0	3	4	3	6	3	3.11	1131/1312	3.11	4.09	4.00	3.98	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	55	0	3	2	6	3	4	3.17	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	55	0	3	2	2	6	5	3.44	****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	55	14	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	61	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	61	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	1	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	70	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	70	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	70	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	70	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	70	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	70	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	70	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	70	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	70	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	70	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	70	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	70	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	70	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 166
 Questionnaires: 73

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 139
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	26						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	22	General	2	Under-grad	73	Non-major	63
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	20	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	57				
				?	2						

Title MICROBIOLOGY

Baltimore County

JUN 14, 2005

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Spring 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 166

Questionnaires: 73

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	4	11	30	26	4.10	1052/1504	4.10	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	6	19	35	11	3.72	1226/1503	3.72	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	8	25	28	10	3.56	1140/1290	3.56	4.18	4.28	4.27	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	50	0	3	6	6	6	3.71	1209/1453	3.71	4.08	4.21	4.20	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	6	12	22	15	12	3.22	1249/1421	3.22	3.99	4.00	3.90	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	56	0	2	5	4	3	3.57	****/1365	****	3.88	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	3	3	13	19	32	4.06	964/1485	4.06	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	5	65	4.93	525/1504	4.93	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	1	21	27	6	3.69	1157/1483	3.75	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	3	14	42	4.66	572/1425	4.41	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	2	9	47	4.78	790/1426	4.73	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	0	9	26	22	4.17	922/1418	3.92	4.28	4.25	4.22	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	5	18	34	4.45	701/1416	4.34	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	4	1	2	9	23	17	4.02	632/1199	3.94	4.13	3.97	3.95	3.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	54	0	3	4	3	6	3	3.11	1131/1312	3.11	4.09	4.00	3.98	3.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	55	0	3	2	6	3	4	3.17	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	55	0	3	2	2	6	5	3.44	****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	55	14	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	61	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	61	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	61	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	61	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	61	1	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	70	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	70	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	70	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	70	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	70	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	70	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	70	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	70	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	70	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	70	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	70	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	70	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	70	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	70	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 166
 Questionnaires: 73

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 140
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	26						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	22	General	2	Under-grad	73	Non-major	63
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	20	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	57				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 141
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	788/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	8	4.05	1027/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	832/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	10	7	4.10	947/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	8	5	7	3.95	804/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	4	6	6	3.79	981/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	5	8	3.81	1146/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	940/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	1009/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	1147/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1008/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	5	4	8	3.89	1102/1418	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.22	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	7	7	3.95	1071/1416	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.24	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	815/1199	3.87	4.13	3.97	3.95	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	716/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	881/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1004/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	563/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	3.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	109/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.30
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	107/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	76/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.68
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	83/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.65
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	3	1	5	4	6	3.47	169/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	3.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 141
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 142
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	788/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	8	4.05	1027/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	832/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	10	7	4.10	947/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	8	5	7	3.95	804/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	4	6	6	3.79	981/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	5	8	3.81	1146/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	940/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1405/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1394/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	3.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	****/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/1418	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.22	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	****/1416	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.24	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1199	3.87	4.13	3.97	3.95	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	716/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	881/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1004/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	563/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	3.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	109/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.30
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	107/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	76/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.68
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	83/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.65
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	3	1	5	4	6	3.47	169/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	3.47
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0101
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 142
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0201
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 143
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	6	7	4.18	981/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	928/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	800/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	1001/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	827/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1003/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	1104/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	460/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	433/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1076/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	905/1418	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	921/1416	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	403/1199	3.87	4.13	3.97	3.95	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	826/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	881/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	922/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	56/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	107/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.40
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	41/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.90
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	51/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	79/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
----------------	----------	-----------------	---------	------	--------

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0301
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 144
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	5	13	4.48	594/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	751/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	758/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	563/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	459/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	717/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	990/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	591/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	784/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	738/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	617/1418	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	574/1416	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	636/1199	3.87	4.13	3.97	3.95	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	592/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	488/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	798/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	92/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	48/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	98/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	76/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	84/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	4.31
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0301
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 144
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0301
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 145
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	5	13	4.48	594/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	751/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	758/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	563/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	459/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	717/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	990/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	433/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	603/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	995/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	317/1418	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	209/1416	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	471/1199	3.87	4.13	3.97	3.95	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	592/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	488/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	798/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	92/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	48/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.69
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	98/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.62
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	76/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.69
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	84/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	4.31
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0301
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 145
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0401
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 146
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	8	13	4.50	549/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	707/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	766/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	844/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	532/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	603/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	5	8	3.86	1110/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	329/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	10	7	4.14	751/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	724/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	825/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	754/1418	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	829/1416	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	919/1199	3.87	4.13	3.97	3.95	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	60/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.58
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	50/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.68
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	120/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	39/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	3	5	8	3.95	122/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	3.95
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0401
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 146
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0401
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 147
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

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	0	1	0	8	13	4.50	549/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	12	4.36	707/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	10	4.27	766/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	844/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	532/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	603/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	7	5	8	3.86	1110/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	329/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	1	11	5	4.00	850/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	1165/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	995/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	947/1418	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	829/1416	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	9	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/1199	3.87	4.13	3.97	3.95	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	60/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.58
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	50/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.68
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	120/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.53
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	39/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.89
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	3	3	5	8	3.95	122/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	3.95
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0401
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 147
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 275L 0601
 Title MICROBIOLOGY LABORATOR
 Instructor: SANDOZ, JAMES W
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 148
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	972/1504	4.37	4.39	4.27	4.26	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	919/1503	4.23	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	839/1290	4.24	4.18	4.28	4.27	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	968/1453	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.20	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	935/1421	4.11	3.99	4.00	3.90	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	7	2	3.79	981/1365	3.98	3.88	4.08	4.00	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	6	1	6	2	3.13	1374/1485	3.79	4.14	4.16	4.15	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1052/1504	4.85	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	679/1483	4.03	4.05	4.06	4.02	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	10	5	4.25	1036/1425	4.13	4.47	4.41	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1081/1426	4.67	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	736/1418	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.22	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	1008/1416	4.32	4.32	4.26	4.24	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	6	2	3	3.31	997/1199	3.87	4.13	3.97	3.95	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	716/1312	4.06	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	563/1303	4.35	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	570/1299	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.21	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 758	3.57	3.90	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	88/ 233	4.44	4.59	4.09	4.30	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	125/ 244	4.53	4.62	4.09	4.24	4.30
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	102/ 227	4.64	4.74	4.40	4.58	4.60
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	130/ 225	4.70	4.71	4.23	4.52	4.30
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	162/ 207	3.92	4.50	4.09	4.22	3.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: LEIPS, JEFF (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 262
 Questionnaires: 113

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 149
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	7	12	44	48	4.17	991/1504	4.17	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	16	45	44	4.12	981/1503	4.12	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	19	40	46	4.09	902/1290	4.09	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	73	6	3	5	18	7	3.44	1317/1453	3.44	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	6	11	31	32	26	3.58	1073/1421	3.58	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	78	5	7	7	6	6	3.03	1292/1365	3.03	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	3	19	34	51	4.18	842/1485	4.18	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	2	2	105	4.92	591/1504	4.92	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	2	1	1	23	45	18	3.89	1009/1483	4.06	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	7	22	81	4.62	649/1425	4.63	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	1	5	16	86	4.66	967/1426	4.73	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	15	26	64	4.32	790/1418	4.37	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	7	8	29	67	4.38	776/1416	4.47	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	0	2	9	22	66	4.54	253/1199	4.44	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	7	2	19	15	25	3.72	917/1312	3.72	4.09	4.00	4.09	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	3	3	16	15	33	4.03	905/1303	4.03	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	3	3	15	12	36	4.09	902/1299	4.09	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	43	20	4	5	18	9	14	3.48	586/ 758	3.48	3.90	4.01	4.00	3.48

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors	5
28-55	17	1.00-1.99 0	B 52		
56-83	18	2.00-2.99 15	C 14	General	3
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 23	D 1	Under-grad 113	Non-major 68
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	82
			? 4		

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: FREELAND, STEPH (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 262
 Questionnaires: 113

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 150
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	12	44	48	4.17	991/1504	4.17	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	16	45	44	4.12	981/1503	4.12	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	19	40	46	4.09	902/1290	4.09	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	73	6	3	5	18	7	3.44	1317/1453	3.44	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	6	11	31	32	26	3.58	1073/1421	3.58	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	78	5	7	7	6	6	3.03	1292/1365	3.03	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	3	19	34	51	4.18	842/1485	4.18	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	2	2	105	4.92	591/1504	4.92	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	4	0	0	15	32	34	4.23	657/1483	4.06	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	4	24	76	4.67	572/1425	4.63	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	4	15	83	4.75	843/1426	4.73	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	2	9	31	62	4.47	617/1418	4.37	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	5	25	72	4.57	554/1416	4.47	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	9	1	4	8	17	64	4.48	300/1199	4.44	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	7	2	19	15	25	3.72	917/1312	3.72	4.09	4.00	4.09	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	3	3	16	15	33	4.03	905/1303	4.03	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	3	3	15	12	36	4.09	902/1299	4.09	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	43	20	4	5	18	9	14	3.48	586/ 758	3.48	3.90	4.01	4.00	3.48

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors	5
28-55	17	1.00-1.99 0	B 52		
56-83	18	2.00-2.99 15	C 14	General	3
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 23	D 1	Under-grad	113
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	82
			? 4		

Course-Section: BIOL 301 0101
 Title ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 262
 Questionnaires: 113

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 151
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	7	12	44	48	4.17	991/1504	4.17	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	16	45	44	4.12	981/1503	4.12	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	19	40	46	4.09	902/1290	4.09	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	73	6	3	5	18	7	3.44	1317/1453	3.44	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	3	6	11	31	32	26	3.58	1073/1421	3.58	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	78	5	7	7	6	6	3.03	1292/1365	3.03	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	3	19	34	51	4.18	842/1485	4.18	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	2	2	105	4.92	591/1504	4.92	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	28	2	1	2	16	35	29	4.07	810/1483	4.06	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	1	1	2	29	70	4.61	649/1425	4.63	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	4	11	87	4.78	790/1426	4.73	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	6	11	24	60	4.33	772/1418	4.37	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	4	9	20	69	4.48	662/1416	4.47	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	13	2	5	7	23	51	4.32	446/1199	4.44	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	7	2	19	15	25	3.72	917/1312	3.72	4.09	4.00	4.09	3.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	3	3	16	15	33	4.03	905/1303	4.03	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	3	3	15	12	36	4.09	902/1299	4.09	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	43	20	4	5	18	9	14	3.48	586/ 758	3.48	3.90	4.01	4.00	3.48

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors	5
28-55	17	1.00-1.99 0	B 52		
56-83	18	2.00-2.99 15	C 14	General	3
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 23	D 1	Under-grad 113	Non-major 68
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	82
			? 4		

Course-Section: BIOL 302 0101
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI
 Instructor: BRADLEY, BRIAN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 254
 Questionnaires: 115

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 152
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	3	8	24	53	24	3.78	1257/1504	3.78	4.39	4.27	4.27	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	8	45	38	18	3.54	1294/1503	3.54	4.23	4.20	4.22	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	6	11	36	32	27	3.56	1140/1290	3.56	4.18	4.28	4.31	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	80	2	6	14	5	5	3.16	1385/1453	3.16	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	5	8	41	24	29	3.60	1061/1421	3.60	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	94	1	1	10	3	3	3.33	****/1365	****	3.88	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	3	21	25	59	4.21	818/1485	4.21	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	0	0	1	4	103	4.94	394/1504	4.94	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	5	0	2	23	33	29	4.02	838/1483	3.40	4.05	4.06	4.08	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	4	22	42	39	4.03	1157/1425	3.99	4.47	4.41	4.43	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	5	12	36	56	4.28	1256/1426	4.15	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	4	9	24	40	31	3.79	1150/1418	3.33	4.28	4.25	4.26	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	5	8	20	34	42	3.92	1092/1416	3.34	4.32	4.26	4.27	3.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	33	6	11	17	15	25	3.57	898/1199	3.46	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	79	0	10	6	8	5	7	2.81	1200/1312	2.81	4.09	4.00	4.09	2.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	80	0	8	3	9	6	9	3.14	1185/1303	3.14	4.39	4.24	4.27	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	81	0	4	2	10	11	7	3.44	1126/1299	3.44	4.29	4.25	4.30	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	81	23	0	2	5	0	4	3.55	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	110	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	113	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	111	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	110	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	114	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						

56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	1	Under-grad 115	Non-major 110
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P	0				
				I	0	Other	22		
				?	0				

Course-Section: BIOL 302 0101
 Title MOLEC & GENERAL GENETI
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 254
 Questionnaires: 115

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 153
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	3	8	24	53	24	3.78	1257/1504	3.78	4.39	4.27	4.27	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	8	45	38	18	3.54	1294/1503	3.54	4.23	4.20	4.22	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	6	11	36	32	27	3.56	1140/1290	3.56	4.18	4.28	4.31	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	80	2	6	14	5	5	3.16	1385/1453	3.16	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	5	8	41	24	29	3.60	1061/1421	3.60	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	94	1	1	10	3	3	3.33	****/1365	****	3.88	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	3	21	25	59	4.21	818/1485	4.21	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	0	0	1	4	103	4.94	394/1504	4.94	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	3	15	16	34	13	7	2.78	1420/1483	3.40	4.05	4.06	4.08	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	2	9	22	33	41	3.95	1194/1425	3.99	4.47	4.41	4.43	3.99
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	9	23	27	46	4.02	1318/1426	4.15	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	18	29	27	15	18	2.87	1356/1418	3.33	4.28	4.25	4.26	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	5	28	15	27	10	19	2.77	1353/1416	3.34	4.32	4.26	4.27	3.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	14	14	13	19	15	29	3.36	980/1199	3.46	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	79	0	10	6	8	5	7	2.81	1200/1312	2.81	4.09	4.00	4.09	2.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	80	0	8	3	9	6	9	3.14	1185/1303	3.14	4.39	4.24	4.27	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	81	0	4	2	10	11	7	3.44	1126/1299	3.44	4.29	4.25	4.30	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	81	23	0	2	5	0	4	3.55	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	110	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	113	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	111	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	110	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	111	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	114	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	6
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	10
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
				0	Major
					5

56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	1	Under-grad 115	Non-major 110
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P	0				
				I	0	Other	22		
				?	0				

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 154
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	12	10	4.23	914/1504	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	837/1503	4.42	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	9	11	4.12	880/1290	4.32	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	12	10	4.19	844/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	4	6	6	5	3.45	1144/1421	3.83	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	5	11	7	3.92	878/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	4	4	15	4.19	830/1485	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	5	19	4.62	1022/1504	4.76	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	13	5	4.10	798/1483	4.28	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	587/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	4	3	19	4.58	1073/1426	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	905/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	8	13	4.32	814/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	3	1	3	5	6	3.56	901/1199	4.03	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	434/1312	4.39	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	378/1303	4.37	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	550/1299	4.30	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	12	9	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	96/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	1	6	13	4.36	114/ 244	4.62	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	3	3	15	4.45	136/ 227	4.68	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	106/ 225	4.77	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.48
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	2	2	5	12	4.14	99/ 207	4.61	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.14
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 154
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 155
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	12	10	4.23	914/1504	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	837/1503	4.42	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	3	9	11	4.12	880/1290	4.32	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	12	10	4.19	844/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	4	6	6	5	3.45	1144/1421	3.83	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	5	11	7	3.92	878/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	4	4	15	4.19	830/1485	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	5	19	4.62	1022/1504	4.76	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	635/1483	4.28	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	420/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	1022/1426	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	848/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	714/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	8	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	636/1199	4.03	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	434/1312	4.39	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	378/1303	4.37	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	550/1299	4.30	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	12	9	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	96/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.36
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	2	1	6	13	4.36	114/ 244	4.62	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.36
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	1	3	3	15	4.45	136/ 227	4.68	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.45
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	106/ 225	4.77	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.48
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	1	2	2	5	12	4.14	99/ 207	4.61	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.14
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0201
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 155
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0301
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 156
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

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	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	654/1504	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	736/1503	4.42	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	8	13	4.35	701/1290	4.32	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	11	8	4.24	798/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	7	9	4.05	718/1421	3.83	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	462/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	433/1485	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	1006/1504	4.76	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	679/1483	4.28	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	366/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	690/1426	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	342/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	525/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	195/1199	4.03	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	364/1312	4.39	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	833/1303	4.37	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	897/1299	4.30	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	56/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	29/ 244	4.62	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	86/ 227	4.68	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.65
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	22/ 225	4.77	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.95
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	19/ 207	4.61	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.90
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0301
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 157
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

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	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	654/1504	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	12	4.35	736/1503	4.42	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	8	13	4.35	701/1290	4.32	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	11	8	4.24	798/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	7	9	4.05	718/1421	3.83	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	462/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	433/1485	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	1006/1504	4.76	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	1	6	10	4.21	679/1483	4.28	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	492/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	1073/1426	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	488/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	511/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	403/1199	4.03	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	364/1312	4.39	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	833/1303	4.37	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	897/1299	4.30	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	56/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	29/ 244	4.62	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	86/ 227	4.68	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.65
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	22/ 225	4.77	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.95
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	19/ 207	4.61	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.90
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0401
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 158
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	737/1504	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	495/1503	4.42	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	749/1290	4.32	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	13	4.29	729/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	4	5	9	3.90	863/1421	3.83	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	7	9	3.87	928/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	577/1485	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	591/1504	4.76	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	591/1483	4.28	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	315/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	251/1426	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	488/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	485/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	2	7	3	5	3.65	868/1199	4.03	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	651/1312	4.39	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	910/1303	4.37	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	855/1299	4.30	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	50/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.65
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	47/ 244	4.62	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	44/ 227	4.68	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	60/ 225	4.77	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.76
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	44/ 207	4.61	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C 1	General 0 Under-grad 24 Non-major 8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 1	Electives 0
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	Other 18
				? 0	

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0401
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 159
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	13	4.38	737/1504	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	495/1503	4.42	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	749/1290	4.32	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	13	4.29	729/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	4	5	9	3.90	863/1421	3.83	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	7	9	3.87	928/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	577/1485	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	591/1504	4.76	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	602/1483	4.28	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	572/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	736/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	446/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	5	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1199	4.03	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	651/1312	4.39	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	910/1303	4.37	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	855/1299	4.30	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	50/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.65
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	47/ 244	4.62	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.71
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	44/ 227	4.68	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.88
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	60/ 225	4.77	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.76
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	44/ 207	4.61	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	8
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 302L 0501
 Title MOL & GEN GENETICS LAB
 Instructor: CARUSO, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 160
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	669/1504	4.36	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	258/1503	4.42	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	290/1290	4.32	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	901/1453	4.23	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	745/1421	3.83	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	245/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	890/1485	4.34	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	4.76	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1483	4.28	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	620/1426	4.76	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	380/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	636/1199	4.03	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	364/1312	4.39	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	356/1303	4.37	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1299	4.30	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	88/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.40
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	64/ 244	4.62	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.60
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	59/ 227	4.68	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.80
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 225	4.77	4.71	4.23	4.29	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	29/ 207	4.61	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.80

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY
 Instructor: KLOETZEL, JOHN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 237
 Questionnaires: 98

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 161
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	3	15	40	35	4.12	1038/1504	4.12	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	4	8	26	32	23	3.67	1247/1503	3.67	4.23	4.20	4.22	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	5	15	26	26	21	3.46	1163/1290	3.46	4.18	4.28	4.31	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	72	3	1	3	5	11	3.87	****/1453	****	4.08	4.21	4.23	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	2	3	9	21	26	30	3.80	947/1421	3.80	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	76	2	2	2	4	6	3.63	****/1365	****	3.88	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	4	13	15	16	26	20	3.28	1344/1485	3.28	4.14	4.16	4.17	3.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	4	89	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	2	3	33	44	9	3.60	1197/1483	3.48	4.05	4.06	4.08	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	7	29	55	4.50	784/1425	4.54	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	12	26	53	4.42	1183/1426	4.36	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	7	24	27	32	3.87	1115/1418	3.79	4.28	4.25	4.26	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	5	18	33	34	4.03	1018/1416	3.96	4.32	4.26	4.27	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	9	2	9	15	22	33	3.93	725/1199	4.08	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	81	0	5	2	4	1	5	2.94	****/1312	****	4.09	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	81	0	3	2	1	3	8	3.65	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	81	0	2	0	4	5	6	3.76	****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	81	12	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	97	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	97	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	97	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	97	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	97	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	59
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	33						
56-83	39	2.00-2.99	5	C	18	General	1	Under-grad	98	Non-major	39
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	20	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	38	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	83				
				?	8						

Course-Section: BIOL 303 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 237
 Questionnaires: 98

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 162
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	3	15	40	35	4.12	1038/1504	4.12	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	4	8	26	32	23	3.67	1247/1503	3.67	4.23	4.20	4.22	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	5	15	26	26	21	3.46	1163/1290	3.46	4.18	4.28	4.31	3.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	72	3	1	3	5	11	3.87	****/1453	****	4.08	4.21	4.23	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	2	3	9	21	26	30	3.80	947/1421	3.80	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	76	2	2	2	4	6	3.63	****/1365	****	3.88	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	4	13	15	16	26	20	3.28	1344/1485	3.28	4.14	4.16	4.17	3.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	4	89	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	2	8	38	26	7	3.35	1298/1483	3.48	4.05	4.06	4.08	3.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	1	6	15	51	4.59	688/1425	4.54	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	3	11	20	39	4.30	1248/1426	4.36	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	3	8	19	20	23	3.71	1181/1418	3.79	4.28	4.25	4.26	3.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	1	1	5	19	23	24	3.89	1108/1416	3.96	4.32	4.26	4.27	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	27	6	1	4	8	18	34	4.23	511/1199	4.08	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	81	0	5	2	4	1	5	2.94	****/1312	****	4.09	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	81	0	3	2	1	3	8	3.65	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	81	0	2	0	4	5	6	3.76	****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	81	12	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	97	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	97	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	97	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	97	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	97	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	59
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	33						
56-83	39	2.00-2.99	5	C	18	General	1	Under-grad	98	Non-major	39
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	20	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	38	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	83				
				?	8						

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY LAB
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN
 Enrollment: 208
 Questionnaires: 160

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 163
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	32	0	1	2	11	44	70	4.41	700/1504	4.41	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	33	0	0	2	4	33	88	4.63	357/1503	4.63	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	34	0	2	5	13	39	67	4.30	741/1290	4.30	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	34	5	2	4	16	29	70	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	38	16	4	3	17	27	55	4.19	605/1421	4.19	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	40	1	3	8	27	30	51	3.99	794/1365	3.99	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.99
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	39	0	0	1	7	39	74	4.54	423/1485	4.54	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	40	2	0	0	0	11	107	4.91	657/1504	4.91	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	3	2	2	14	72	63	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	71	0	0	0	2	6	81	4.89	209/1425	4.89	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	72	0	0	0	4	16	68	4.73	878/1426	4.73	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	72	0	0	0	1	15	72	4.81	191/1418	4.81	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	72	1	1	1	2	15	68	4.70	394/1416	4.70	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	78	28	2	2	11	18	21	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	125	0	0	0	3	5	27	4.69	****/1312	****	4.09	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	127	0	0	1	6	9	17	4.27	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	128	0	1	1	6	6	18	4.22	****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	129	10	1	2	3	8	7	3.86	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	77	0	1	1	7	19	55	4.52	69/ 233	4.52	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.52
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	77	0	0	1	1	17	64	4.73	41/ 244	4.73	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	80	0	1	1	2	20	56	4.61	98/ 227	4.61	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.61
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	78	0	0	0	7	13	62	4.67	80/ 225	4.67	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	78	1	0	5	8	18	50	4.40	70/ 207	4.40	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	158	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	158	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	158	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	158	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	159	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: BIOL 303L 0101
 Title CELL BIOLOGY LAB
 Instructor: MACKAY, BRYAN
 Enrollment: 208
 Questionnaires: 160

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 163
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	64	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	82
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	42						
56-83	44	2.00-2.99	19	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	159	Non-major	78
84-150	34	3.00-3.49	31	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	37	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	122				
				?	5						

Course-Section: BIOL 305 0101
 Title COMP. ANIMAL PHYSIOLOG
 Instructor: VIANCOUR, TERRY
 Enrollment: 173
 Questionnaires: 95

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 164
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	1	5	29	55	4.53	509/1504	4.53	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	3	2	17	30	38	4.09	1002/1503	4.09	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	8	24	22	36	3.96	979/1290	3.96	4.18	4.28	4.31	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	70	1	0	1	5	13	4.45	****/1453	****	4.08	4.21	4.23	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	7	11	28	20	22	3.44	1150/1421	3.44	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	76	0	2	3	1	7	4.00	****/1365	****	3.88	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	8	18	19	43	4.10	938/1485	4.10	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	0	87	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	1	0	15	36	26	4.10	793/1483	4.10	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.10

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	5	9	68	4.77	402/1425	4.77	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	1	4	9	65	4.75	843/1426	4.75	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	4	10	26	39	4.27	838/1418	4.27	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	6	15	56	4.57	564/1416	4.57	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	1	0	1	7	9	55	4.64	195/1199	4.64	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.64

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	79	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	****/1312	****	4.09	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	77	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	79	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	79	8	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	94	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	94	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	94	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	93	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	94	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	69
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	31						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	8	C	24	General	0	Under-grad	95	Non-major	26
84-150	30	3.00-3.49	16	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	23	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	74				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 305L 0101
 Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 165
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	972/1504	4.48	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	827/1503	4.61	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	681/1290	4.73	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	855/1453	4.51	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	745/1421	4.09	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	731/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	842/1485	4.53	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	989/1483	4.26	4.05	4.06	4.08	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	618/1425	4.74	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	878/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	526/1418	4.64	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	688/1416	4.61	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	845/1199	4.28	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1312	4.42	4.09	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1299	4.44	4.29	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	132/ 233	4.58	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	102/ 244	4.69	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	108/ 227	4.74	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.57
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	148/ 225	4.71	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.14
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	53/ 207	4.73	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 305L 0201
 Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 166
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	927/1504	4.48	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	248/1503	4.61	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	180/1290	4.73	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	9	8	4.33	680/1453	4.51	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	705/1421	4.09	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	4	7	4	3.50	1153/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	716/1485	4.53	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	9	4	3.88	1009/1483	4.26	4.05	4.06	4.08	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	712/1425	4.74	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	940/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	736/1418	4.64	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	623/1416	4.61	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	776/1199	4.28	4.13	3.97	4.02	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1312	4.42	4.09	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1299	4.44	4.29	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	131/ 233	4.58	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.15
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	125/ 244	4.69	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	163/ 227	4.74	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.31
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	90/ 225	4.71	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.62
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	57/ 207	4.73	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.54

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 305L 0301
 Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 167
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	737/1504	4.48	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	357/1503	4.61	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	389/1290	4.73	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	775/1453	4.51	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	887/1421	4.09	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	690/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	455/1485	4.53	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	850/1483	4.26	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	420/1425	4.74	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	825/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	261/1418	4.64	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	498/1416	4.61	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	495/1199	4.28	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1312	4.42	4.09	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1299	4.44	4.29	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 233	4.58	4.59	4.09	4.12	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 244	4.69	4.62	4.09	4.20	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 227	4.74	4.74	4.40	4.46	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 225	4.71	4.71	4.23	4.29	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 207	4.73	4.50	4.09	4.14	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 305L 0401
 Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 168
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	3	8	4.50	549/1504	4.48	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	403/1503	4.61	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	344/1290	4.73	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	352/1453	4.51	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	692/1421	4.09	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	297/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	370/1485	4.53	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	778/1504	4.97	4.90	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	167/1483	4.26	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	285/1425	4.74	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	967/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	378/1418	4.64	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	446/1416	4.61	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	320/1199	4.28	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	465/1312	4.42	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	910/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	922/1299	4.44	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	56/ 233	4.58	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	48/ 244	4.69	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.70
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	73/ 227	4.74	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.70
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	92/ 225	4.71	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.60
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 207	4.73	4.50	4.09	4.14	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: BIOL 305L 0401
 Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 168
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 305L 0501
 Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 169
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	161/1504	4.48	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	238/1503	4.61	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	159/1290	4.73	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	158/1453	4.51	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	509/1421	4.09	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	245/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	240/1485	4.53	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	108/1483	4.26	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	125/1425	4.74	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	191/1418	4.64	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	255/1416	4.61	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	88/1199	4.28	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	221/1312	4.42	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1299	4.44	4.29	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	33/ 233	4.58	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.79
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	32/ 244	4.69	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.79
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	50/ 227	4.74	4.74	4.40	4.46	4.86
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	29/ 225	4.71	4.71	4.23	4.29	4.92
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	42/ 207	4.73	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 305L 0601
 Title COMP ANIMAL PHYSIO. LA
 Instructor: LAKE, REAGAN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 170
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	262/1504	4.48	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	248/1503	4.61	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1290	4.73	4.18	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	101/1453	4.51	4.08	4.21	4.23	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	4	0	6	4.20	596/1421	4.09	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	3	0	6	4.00	782/1365	4.13	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	98/1485	4.53	4.14	4.16	4.17	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	710/1483	4.26	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.18

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	525/1425	4.74	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	342/1418	4.64	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	525/1416	4.61	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	242/1199	4.28	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.56

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	663/1312	4.42	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	737/1303	4.44	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	741/1299	4.44	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.00	****

Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	34/ 233	4.58	4.59	4.09	4.12	4.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	21/ 244	4.69	4.62	4.09	4.20	4.89
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 227	4.74	4.74	4.40	4.46	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 225	4.71	4.71	4.23	4.29	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	55/ 207	4.73	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.56

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	10
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 397 0101
 Title ETHICS/INTEG SCIENT RE
 Instructor: KLOETZEL, JOHN
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 171
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	1	5	8	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	9	5	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.23	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	866/1290	4.14	4.18	4.28	4.31	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1307/1453	3.45	4.08	4.21	4.23	3.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	2	2	8	3.53	1101/1421	3.53	3.99	4.00	4.01	3.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1201/1365	3.40	3.88	4.08	4.08	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	1128/1485	3.83	4.14	4.16	4.17	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	624/1483	4.27	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	603/1425	4.64	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.67	4.69	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	317/1418	4.71	4.28	4.25	4.26	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	961/1416	4.14	4.32	4.26	4.27	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	561/1199	4.17	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.09	4.00	4.09	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	268/1303	4.83	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.29	4.25	4.30	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	3.90	4.01	4.00	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	15						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 397W 0101
 Title SCIENTIFIC WRITING
 Instructor: PORTER, JANE P.
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 172
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.23	4.20	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.08	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	548/1421	4.25	3.99	4.00	4.01	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	493/1365	4.33	3.88	4.08	4.08	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.14	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1483	4.75	4.05	4.06	4.08	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.28	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.32	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.13	3.97	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.09	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	3.90	4.01	4.00	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: BIOL 414 0101
 Title EUKARYOTICS GEN/MOL BI
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, PHIL
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 173
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	5	13	4.12	1029/1504	4.12	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	11	5	3.72	1221/1503	3.72	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	7	10	3.96	971/1290	3.96	4.18	4.28	4.32	3.96
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	7	11	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	8	3	4	10	3.64	1030/1421	3.64	3.99	4.00	4.02	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	7	6	10	3.96	830/1365	3.96	3.88	4.08	4.09	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	5	11	5	3.75	1176/1485	3.75	4.14	4.16	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.90	4.69	4.73	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	4	3	9	5	3.71	1147/1483	3.71	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	6	3	12	3.88	1227/1425	3.88	4.47	4.41	4.38	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	3	8	13	4.32	1237/1426	4.32	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	5	5	9	6	3.64	1209/1418	3.64	4.28	4.25	4.25	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	9	8	3.80	1145/1416	3.80	4.32	4.26	4.26	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	3	7	3	10	3.75	820/1199	3.75	4.13	3.97	4.05	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	912/1312	3.73	4.09	4.00	4.07	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	1	3	8	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	1012/1299	3.87	4.29	4.25	4.38	3.87
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	553/ 758	3.62	3.90	4.01	4.17	3.62
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 9
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	20	
?	3			

Course-Section: BIOL 428 0101
 Title COMPUTER APPL MOLEC BI
 Instructor: ONEILL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 174
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	6	4	4.09	1052/1504	4.09	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1221/1503	3.73	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.18	4.28	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1104/1453	3.90	4.08	4.21	4.22	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1017/1421	3.67	3.99	4.00	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.88	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	830/1485	4.20	4.14	4.16	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	1009/1483	3.89	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	2	5	1	3.30	1337/1425	3.30	4.47	4.41	4.38	3.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	1	5	1	3.20	1314/1418	3.20	4.28	4.25	4.25	3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	4	2	3.30	1287/1416	3.30	4.32	4.26	4.26	3.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	4.13	3.97	4.05	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	4.09	4.00	4.07	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	3	0	3	2	3.50	1121/1303	3.50	4.39	4.24	4.34	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1053/1299	3.75	4.29	4.25	4.38	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	102/ 233	4.33	4.59	4.09	3.78	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	224/ 244	3.00	4.62	4.09	3.56	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	153/ 225	4.00	4.71	4.23	3.81	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****

Course-Section: BIOL 428 0101
 Title COMPUTER APPL MOLEC BI
 Instructor: ONEILL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 174
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	10	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	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	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BIOL 434 0101
 Title MICROBIAL MOLEC GENETI
 Instructor: WOLF, RICHARD E
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 175
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	206/1504	4.81	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	258/1503	4.71	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	290/1290	4.71	4.18	4.28	4.32	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	924/1453	4.13	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	158/1421	4.75	3.99	4.00	4.02	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	2	0	0	3	7	4.08	737/1365	4.08	3.88	4.08	4.09	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	240/1485	4.71	4.14	4.16	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	112/1483	4.82	4.05	4.06	4.11	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	179/1425	4.90	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	620/1426	4.86	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	552/1418	4.52	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	380/1416	4.71	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	548/1199	4.19	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	269/1312	4.64	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	981/1299	3.93	4.29	4.25	4.38	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	11	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	10	Non-major	11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 443 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS:DEVEL BIOLO
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, DAPHN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 176
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

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	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	239/1504	4.78	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	13	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1290	****	4.18	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	618/1453	4.39	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	151/1421	4.76	3.99	4.00	4.02	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	407/1365	4.41	3.88	4.08	4.09	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	536/1485	4.44	4.14	4.16	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	493/1483	4.39	4.05	4.06	4.11	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	401/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	736/1418	4.35	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1145/1416	3.90	4.32	4.26	4.26	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	142/1312	4.85	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	157/1303	4.92	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	263/1299	4.85	4.29	4.25	4.38	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	255/ 758	4.38	3.90	4.01	4.17	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 443 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS:DEVEL BIOLO
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 177
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	239/1504	4.78	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	13	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1290	****	4.18	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	618/1453	4.39	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	151/1421	4.76	3.99	4.00	4.02	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	407/1365	4.41	3.88	4.08	4.09	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	536/1485	4.44	4.14	4.16	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	457/1483	4.39	4.05	4.06	4.11	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/1425	4.00	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	926/1426	4.81	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	772/1418	4.35	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1029/1416	3.90	4.32	4.26	4.26	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	142/1312	4.85	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	157/1303	4.92	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	263/1299	4.85	4.29	4.25	4.38	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	255/ 758	4.38	3.90	4.01	4.17	4.38
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	15	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 454 0101
 Title VISION SCIENCE
 Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYLL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 178
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	914/1504	4.23	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1008/1503	4.08	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	2	3.69	1098/1290	3.69	4.18	4.28	4.32	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	1168/1421	3.42	3.99	4.00	4.02	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	4	4.17	672/1365	4.17	3.88	4.08	4.09	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	953/1485	4.08	4.14	4.16	4.14	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	1183/1483	3.77	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.77

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	1050/1425	4.50	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1104/1426	4.69	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1189/1418	3.85	4.28	4.25	4.25	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1004/1416	4.27	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	636/1199	4.21	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.21

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	507/1303	4.60	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.29	4.25	4.38	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	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	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 454 0101
 Title VISION SCIENCE
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 179
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	914/1504	4.23	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1008/1503	4.08	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	2	3.69	1098/1290	3.69	4.18	4.28	4.32	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	1168/1421	3.42	3.99	4.00	4.02	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	7	4	4.17	672/1365	4.17	3.88	4.08	4.09	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	953/1485	4.08	4.14	4.16	4.14	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	989/1483	3.77	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.77

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	402/1425	4.50	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	643/1426	4.69	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1013/1418	3.85	4.28	4.25	4.25	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	675/1416	4.27	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	359/1199	4.21	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.21

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	507/1303	4.60	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.29	4.25	4.38	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	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	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 456 0101
 Title PLANT MOLECULAR BIOLOG
 Instructor: BUSTOS, MAURICI
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 180
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	509/1504	4.54	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	795/1503	4.31	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1290	****	4.18	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	501/1453	4.46	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	320/1421	4.50	3.99	4.00	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	742/1365	4.08	3.88	4.08	4.09	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	3	3	1	4	3.55	1268/1485	3.55	4.14	4.16	4.14	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1345/1504	4.15	4.90	4.69	4.73	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	804/1483	4.08	4.05	4.06	4.11	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	1100/1425	4.15	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	451/1426	4.92	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	848/1418	4.25	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	479/1199	4.27	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	4.83	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.38	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.90	4.01	4.17	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 468 0101
 Title ECOL RIVERS AND STREAM
 Instructor: WEBER, CARL S
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 181
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	318/1504	4.71	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	805/1503	4.29	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	488/1290	4.53	4.18	4.28	4.32	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	963/1453	4.07	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	927/1421	3.82	3.99	4.00	4.02	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	5	7	3.82	954/1365	3.82	3.88	4.08	4.09	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	926/1485	4.12	4.14	4.16	4.14	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	394/1504	4.94	4.90	4.69	4.73	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	385/1483	4.47	4.05	4.06	4.11	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	209/1425	4.88	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	331/1418	4.71	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	232/1416	4.82	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	139/1199	4.73	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	902/1312	3.75	4.09	4.00	4.07	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	863/1303	4.14	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	798/1299	4.25	4.29	4.25	4.38	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 2 Major 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1 Under-grad 17 Non-major 4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	15

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 476 0101
 Title ANTIBOTICS
 Instructor: LOVETT, PAUL S
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 182
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	18	4.90	131/1504	4.90	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	380/1503	4.60	4.23	4.20	4.18	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.18	4.28	4.32	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	2	15	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.08	4.21	4.22	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	14	4.40	410/1421	4.40	3.99	4.00	4.02	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	462/1365	4.37	3.88	4.08	4.09	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	2	1	15	4.35	648/1485	4.35	4.14	4.16	4.14	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	8	5	3.95	933/1483	3.95	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	724/1425	4.55	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	6	10	4.20	905/1418	4.20	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	16	4.55	574/1416	4.55	4.32	4.26	4.26	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	1	1	1	0	7	4.10	600/1199	4.10	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	493/1312	4.38	4.09	4.00	4.07	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.29	4.25	4.38	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101
 Title SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS
 Instructor: LINDAHL, LASSE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 183
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1386/1503	3.22	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1171/1290	3.43	4.18	4.28	4.32	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.08	4.21	4.22	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	0	2	1	2.57	1386/1421	2.57	3.99	4.00	4.02	2.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1249/1365	3.25	3.88	4.08	4.09	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1284/1485	3.50	4.14	4.16	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.90	4.69	4.73	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1302/1483	3.71	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1257/1425	4.01	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1128/1426	4.66	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1163/1418	4.22	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	0	4	3.75	1167/1416	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.26	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	574/1199	4.37	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1312	****	4.09	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
#### - Means there are not enough					

P 0
I 0
? 2

Other

10

responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101
 Title SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 184
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1386/1503	3.22	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1171/1290	3.43	4.18	4.28	4.32	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.08	4.21	4.22	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	0	2	1	2.57	1386/1421	2.57	3.99	4.00	4.02	2.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1249/1365	3.25	3.88	4.08	4.09	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1284/1485	3.50	4.14	4.16	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.90	4.69	4.73	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1061/1483	3.71	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1165/1425	4.01	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	620/1426	4.66	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	947/1418	4.22	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	961/1416	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.26	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	271/1199	4.37	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1312	****	4.09	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/233	****	4.59	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/244	****	4.62	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/227	****	4.74	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/225	****	4.71	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/207	****	4.50	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
#### - Means there are not enough					

P 0
I 0
? 2

Other

10

responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101
 Title SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 185
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1386/1503	3.22	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1171/1290	3.43	4.18	4.28	4.32	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.08	4.21	4.22	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	0	2	1	2.57	1386/1421	2.57	3.99	4.00	4.02	2.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1249/1365	3.25	3.88	4.08	4.09	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1284/1485	3.50	4.14	4.16	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.90	4.69	4.73	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	543/1483	3.71	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	1015/1425	4.01	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	895/1426	4.66	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	488/1418	4.22	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	961/1416	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.26	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	429/1199	4.37	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1312	****	4.09	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
#### - Means there are not enough					

P 0
I 0
? 2

Other

10

responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 495 0101
 Title SEMINAR BIOINFORMATICS
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 186
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.39	4.27	4.33	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	3	2	2	3.22	1386/1503	3.22	4.23	4.20	4.18	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1171/1290	3.43	4.18	4.28	4.32	3.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.08	4.21	4.22	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	0	2	1	2.57	1386/1421	2.57	3.99	4.00	4.02	2.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1249/1365	3.25	3.88	4.08	4.09	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1284/1485	3.50	4.14	4.16	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.90	4.69	4.73	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1302/1483	3.71	4.05	4.06	4.11	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1165/1425	4.01	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.01
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1073/1426	4.66	4.67	4.69	4.72	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	682/1418	4.22	4.28	4.25	4.25	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1122/1416	3.97	4.32	4.26	4.26	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	271/1199	4.37	4.13	3.97	4.05	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1312	****	4.09	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	****	4.29	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.90	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.59	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.62	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.74	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.71	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.50	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.50	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	5.00	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P 0
I 0
? 2

Other

10

responses to be significant

Course-Section: BIOL 636L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 187
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

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	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	125/1503	4.88	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	152/1290	4.88	4.18	4.28	4.36	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1453	4.88	4.08	4.21	4.34	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1421	4.88	3.99	4.00	4.27	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1365	5.00	3.88	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1485	4.88	4.14	4.16	4.24	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	101/1483	4.86	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425	4.93	4.47	4.41	4.51	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	317/1418	4.61	4.28	4.25	4.36	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1416	4.68	4.32	4.26	4.38	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	177/1199	4.67	4.13	3.97	4.04	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.09	4.00	4.31	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.29	4.25	4.56	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	3.90	4.01	4.24	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.59	4.09	4.56	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	22/ 244	4.88	4.62	4.09	4.09	4.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.74	4.40	4.66	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	63/ 225	4.75	4.71	4.23	4.69	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	22/ 207	4.88	4.50	4.09	4.40	4.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	45/ 70	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.21	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	5.00	4.17	4.15	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	22/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.55	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.37	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	3.16	****

Course-Section: BIOL 636L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 187
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 636L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 188
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

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	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.39	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	125/1503	4.88	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	152/1290	4.88	4.18	4.28	4.36	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1453	4.88	4.08	4.21	4.34	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	101/1421	4.88	3.99	4.00	4.27	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1365	5.00	3.88	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1485	4.88	4.14	4.16	4.24	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1483	4.86	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	4.93	4.47	4.41	4.51	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1418	4.61	4.28	4.25	4.36	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.68	4.32	4.26	4.38	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	4.67	4.13	3.97	4.04	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.09	4.00	4.31	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	504/1299	4.60	4.29	4.25	4.56	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	3.90	4.01	4.24	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.59	4.09	4.56	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	22/ 244	4.88	4.62	4.09	4.09	4.88
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.74	4.40	4.66	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	63/ 225	4.75	4.71	4.23	4.69	4.75
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	22/ 207	4.88	4.50	4.09	4.40	4.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	45/ 70	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.21	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	5.00	4.17	4.15	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	22/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.44	4.55	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.37	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	3.16	****

Course-Section: BIOL 636L 0101
 Title ADV MOLEC BIOL LAB II
 Instructor: WOLF, JULIE B (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 188
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 654 0101
 Title VISION SCIENCE
 Instructor: ROBINSON, PHYLL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 189
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	889/1504	4.25	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.18	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	775/1453	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.34	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	548/1421	4.25	3.99	4.00	4.27	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	581/1365	4.25	3.88	4.08	4.35	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.14	4.16	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	784/1425	4.63	4.47	4.41	4.51	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1418	4.63	4.28	4.25	4.36	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.32	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	636/1199	4.25	4.13	3.97	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1070/1312	3.33	4.09	4.00	4.31	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	580/ 758	3.50	3.90	4.01	4.24	3.50

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	2	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
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	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BIOL 654 0101
 Title VISION SCIENCE
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 190
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	889/1504	4.25	4.39	4.27	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.23	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.18	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	775/1453	4.25	4.08	4.21	4.34	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	548/1421	4.25	3.99	4.00	4.27	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	581/1365	4.25	3.88	4.08	4.35	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.14	4.16	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.90	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.05	4.06	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.63	4.47	4.41	4.51	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.67	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	578/1418	4.63	4.28	4.25	4.36	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.32	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	271/1199	4.25	4.13	3.97	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1070/1312	3.33	4.09	4.00	4.31	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	580/ 758	3.50	3.90	4.01	4.24	3.50

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	2	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
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	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						