

<b>Course</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>152</b>
	Animal Biology	Animal Biology Lab	Intro Bio I	Intro Bio II
Total Surveyed	760	368	742	446
Total Completed	332	155	335	207
Response Rate	44%	42%	45%	46%
The course helped me to understand the main concepts in this subject area.	4.21	4.43	4.06	3.84
The course helped me to understand the relationships among these main concepts.	4.05	4.44	3.92	3.75
The course helped me to understand how concepts presented in this course relate to those in other biosciences courses.	3.99	4.17	3.93	3.72
The course helped me to understand the relevance of this particular subject to real-world issues or everyday life.	4.11	4.19	3.90	3.86
This course helped to develop my ability to think through a problem and solve it.	3.79	4.05	3.68	3.30
This course compared favorably to others I have taken in the biosciences.	3.59	3.94	3.46	2.82
The exams and assignments were well designed to test the knowledge I was expected to gain in this course.	3.82	3.98	3.57	3.29
I appreciate this subject better as a result of taking this course.	3.80	4.24	3.68	3.23
This course stimulated my desire to take additional courses in this subject area.	3.32	3.48	3.53	2.81
I understand the scientific process better as a result of taking this course.	3.78	4.00	3.81	3.51
Overall, I would recommend this course to other students.	3.65	3.97	3.55	2.81

<b>153</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>430</b>	
Intro Bio for Eng	Limnology	Limnology lab	Museum Studies	Evolution	Comp. Anatomy	
67	93	35	15	61	36	
24	34	15	8	16	17	
36%	37%	43%	53%	26%	47%	
3.96	4.53	4.49	4.75	4.44	4.35	
3.83	4.53	4.40	4.63	4.38	4.35	
3.55	4.26	4.49	4.38	4.38	4.29	
3.64	4.59	4.49	4.75	4.44	4.24	
3.27	3.88	4.43	4.25	4.19	3.94	
3.02	4.06	4.32	4.25	4.00	4.12	
3.86	4.12	4.06	4.00	3.44	4.18	
3.47	4.56	4.61	4.75	4.31	4.24	
2.93	3.94	4.28	4.25	3.94	3.71	
3.32	4.03	4.24	4.25	3.94	4.06	
3.22	4.26	4.21	4.25	3.88	4.00	

<b>500</b>	<b>523</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>555</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>911</b>	
Neurobio Seminar	Neurobiology	Theoretical Ecol	Develop. Bio. Lab	Cell Biology	Limnol. Mar. Sci Sem	
125	357	20	13	72	18	
46	121	9	5	29	8	
37%	34%	45%	38%	40%	44%	
3.96	4.26	4.11	5.00	4.34	4.50	
4.15	4.20	4.33	4.80	4.45	4.50	
4.28	4.29	4.33	5.00	4.41	4.50	
4.57	4.20	4.56	4.80	4.45	4.75	
3.52	3.89	4.11	5.00	4.00	4.00	
4.00	3.82	4.00	5.00	3.86	4.50	
4.00	3.87	4.50	4.60	3.83	3.75	
4.24	4.12	4.63	5.00	4.14	4.63	
4.00	3.88	4.00	5.00	3.72	4.75	
4.22	3.88	4.00	4.80	4.17	4.25	
4.30	3.89	4.33	5.00	3.83	4.75	

<b>953</b>	<b>955</b>	<b>957</b>	<b>960</b>		
Intro To Ecol at UW sem	Limnol. Sem	Evolution Sem	Sem in Cell Bio		
9	11	6	6		
5	5	3	1		
56%	45%	50%	17%	Department Avg	
3.60	4.60	4.33	5.00		4.15
4.00	4.20	4.33	5.00		4.07
4.00	4.20	4.67	5.00		4.02
3.60	4.40	4.00	5.00		4.08
3.40	4.60	4.33	5.00		3.75
3.60	4.20	4.00	5.00		3.56
3.40	4.60	4.00	5.00		3.73
3.80	4.40	4.67	5.00		3.84
4.00	4.40	4.67	5.00		3.45
3.40	4.60	4.33	5.00		3.83
3.60	4.20	4.67	5.00		3.62

Course	101	101	101	151	151
<b>Instructor</b>	<b>John, ORROCK</b>	<b>WILLIAM, BEMENT</b>	<b>Sharon, THOMA</b>	<b>Donna Fernandez</b>	<b>Phil Newmark</b>
Total Surveyed	760	760	760	642	642
Total Completed	298	298	298	304	211
Response Rate	39%	39%	39%	47%	33%
The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject.	4.48	3.935	4.6	4.16	4.56
The instructor stimulated my interest.	4.095	3.34	4.375	3.15	3.09
The instructor defined course objectives, expectations, and requirements clearly.	4.12	3.84	4.54	3.71	3.07
The instructor explained the relationships among concepts/course topics.	4.22	3.79	4.39	3.3	3.06
Class meetings were well planned and organized.	4.25	3.865	4.46	3.56	3.82
Regardless of the grade I received, I learned a lot from this instructor.	4.235	3.675	4.5	3.58	3.34
This instructor's methods for evaluating student performance (e.g. assignments and grading techniques) were well designed and fair.	4.065	3.95	4.2	3.81	3.52
The instructor was available for consultation in the form of emails, questions after class, and office hours.	4.015	4.025	4.25	4.03	4.05
<b>Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.</b>	<b>4.205</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>4.485</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>2.9</b>
Course	151	151	152	152	152

Instructor	Simon Gilroy	Jeremiah Yahn	Ken Keefover-Ring	Kate McCulloh	Prashant Sharma
Total Surveyed	178	178	450	450	450
Total Completed	42	40	102	164	218
Response Rate	24%	22%	22%	36%	48%
The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject.	5	4.38	4.48	4.94	4.81
The instructor stimulated my interest.	4.79	3	3.48	4.56	4.13
The instructor defined course objectives, expectations, and requirements clearly.	4.51	3.17	3.47	4.33	4.12
The instructor explained the relationships among concepts/course topics.	4.69	2.85	3.94	4.52	4.32
Class meetings were well planned and organized.	4.77	3.55	4.08	4.59	4.51
Regardless of the grade I received, I learned a lot from this instructor.	4.67	3.41	3.81	4.54	4.41
This instructor's methods for evaluating student performance (e.g. assignments and grading techniques) were well designed and fair.	4.27	2.97	3.69	4.01	4.29
The instructor was available for consultation in the form of emails, questions after class, and office hours.	4.44	4.23	4.26	4.55	4.48
<b>Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.</b>	<b>4.73</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>4.61</b>	<b>4.39</b>
Course	315	405	410	430	500
Instructor	HILARY, DUGAN	LAURA, MONAHAN	Carol, LEE	Scott, Hartman	MICHAEL, KOENIG

Total Surveyed	93	15	61	36	125
Total Completed	33	6	16	16	44
Response Rate	35%	40%	26%	44%	35%
The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject.	4.85	5	4.94	4.75	4.14
The instructor stimulated my interest.	4.7	4.83	4.56	4.38	3.86
The instructor defined course objectives, expectations, and requirements clearly.	4.58	4.5	4.25	4.33	4.38
The instructor explained the relationships among concepts/course topics.	4.7	4.33	4.75	4.69	3.83
Class meetings were well planned and organized.	4.79	4.67	4.5	4.69	4.31
Regardless of the grade I received, I learned a lot from this instructor.	4.69	4.67	4.63	4.56	3.9
This instructor's methods for evaluating student performance (e.g. assignments and grading techniques) were well designed and fair.	4.45	4.17	3.56	4.31	4.43
The instructor was available for consultation in the form of emails, questions after class, and office hours.	4.36	4.5	4	4.44	4.02
<b>Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.</b>	<b>4.76</b>	<b>4.67</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>3.98</b>
Course	523	540	555	555	570
Instructor	Seth, BLAIR	Anthony, IVES	Mary, HALLORAN	YEVGENYA, GRINBLA	KURT, AMANN
Total Surveyed	357	20	13	13	72

Total Completed	117	9	4	4	27
Response Rate	33%	45%	31%	31%	38%
The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject.	4.73	5	4.75	4.75	4.78
The instructor stimulated my interest.	4.35	4.44	4.75	4.75	4.26
The instructor defined course objectives, expectations, and requirements clearly.	4.29	4.33	4.5	4.75	4.11
The instructor explained the relationships among concepts/course topics.	4.34	4.33	4.75	4.75	4.44
Class meetings were well planned and organized.	4.3	3.67	4.75	4.75	4.04
Regardless of the grade I received, I learned a lot from this instructor.	4.38	4.67	4.75	4.75	4.35
This instructor's methods for evaluating student performance (e.g. assignments and grading techniques) were well designed and fair.	4.22	4.78	4.5	4.5	4.07
The instructor was available for consultation in the form of emails, questions after class, and office hours.	4.25	4.78	4.75	4.75	4.41
<b>Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.</b>	<b>4.29</b>	<b>4.56</b>	<b>4.75</b>	<b>4.75</b>	<b>4.15</b>
Course	911	911	911	953	955
Instructor	Emily, STANLEY	Jake, VANDER ZANDEN	HILARY, DUGAN	Cooper, Rosin	HILARY, DUGAN
Total Surveyed	18	18	18	9	11
Total Completed	6	6	6	4	5



Response Rate	33%	33%	33%	44%	45%
The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject.	4.8	4.8	4.5	4.25	4.8
The instructor stimulated my interest.	4.6	4.8	4.5	3.5	4.4
The instructor defined course objectives, expectations, and requirements clearly.	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.8
The instructor explained the relationships among concepts/course topics.	4.6	4.6	4.5	3.5	4.8
Class meetings were well planned and organized.	4.6	4.6	4.5	4	4.6
Regardless of the grade I received, I learned a lot from this instructor.	4.6	4.6	4.67	3.75	4.8
This instructor's methods for evaluating student performance (e.g. assignments and grading techniques) were well designed and fair.	4.6	4.6	4.33	4	4.8
The instructor was available for consultation in the form of emails, questions after class, and office hours.	4.8	4.6	4.67	3.75	4.8
<b>Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Course	960				
Instructor	<b>WILLIAM, BEMENT</b>				
Total Surveyed	6				
Total Completed	1				
Response Rate	17%				

The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject.	5				
The instructor stimulated my interest.	5				
The instructor defined course objectives, expectations, and requirements clearly.	5				
The instructor explained the relationships among concepts/course topics.	5				
Class meetings were well planned and organized.	5				
Regardless of the grade I received, I learned a lot from this instructor.	5				
This instructor's methods for evaluating student performance (e.g. assignments and grading techniques) were well designed and fair.	5				
The instructor was available for consultation in the form of emails, questions after class, and office hours.	5				
<b>Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.</b>	<b>5</b>				

151
<b>David Abbott</b>
No data yet
315

<b>Emily, STANLEY</b>
93
33
35%
4.59
4.42
4.36
4.61
4.7
4.55
4.27
4.18
<b>4.58</b>
523
<b>STEPHEN, GAMI</b>

357
117
33%
4.42
3.91
4.11
4.03
4.01
4.16
3.9
4.2
<b>3.92</b>
674
<b>Lauren, RITERS</b>
21

8
38%
5
4.88
4.88
4.88
4.63
4.5
4.75
5
<b>5</b>
957
<b>Carol, LEE</b>
6
1






Course	101	101	101	102	102
TA	Jacob, Kraus	Juanita, Diaz	Savannah, Bartel	Andrew, Ontano	Ilianna, Anise
Total Surveyed	760	760	760	56	58
Total Completed	268	268	268	21	27
Response Rate	35%	35%	35%	38%	47%
The TA was clear in presenting subject matter.	3.49	3.70	3.82	4.36	4.72
The TA was well organized.	3.59	3.69	3.83	4.32	4.72
The TA made me feel comfortable to ask questions.	3.43	3.73	3.87	4.23	4.82
The TA presented the material in an interesting and engaging way.	3.48	3.65	3.78	4.25	4.82
Assignments and tests handled by the TA were returned promptly with useful feedback.	3.53	3.68	3.74	4.09	4.42
The TA was available during office hours or by appointment.	3.73	3.75	3.83	4.17	4.42
<b>Considering everything (class size, course objectives, etc.), the TA was an effective teacher.</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>4.36</b>	<b>4.82</b>
	102	102	102	102	
	Bijit, Khadka	Christine, Grebe	Sarah, Edlund	Jasmine, Wyant	
	33	59	54	55	
	10	25	27	23	
	30%	42%	50%	42%	
	4.40	4.81	4.66	4.20	
	4.60	4.77	4.63	5.00	
	4.50	4.80	4.70	5.00	
	3.80	4.58	4.62	4.95	
	4.50	4.40	4.23	4.66	
	4.10	4.43	4.22	4.60	
	<b>4.50</b>	<b>4.84</b>	<b>4.66</b>	<b>4.90</b>	
	151	151	151	151	151
	Alissa, Balke	Kristian, Book	Jorge, De Los Santos Fu	Michael, Menon	Malena, Candino
	39	61	63	54	42

	15	19	33	22	15
	38%	31%	52%	41%	36%
	3.45	3.74	2.71	4.78	3.34
	3.45	3.81	3.16	4.66	3.65
	3.14	4.16	3.89	4.89	2.73
	3.28	3.35	3.36	4.58	3.17
	2.42	3.27	2.75	4.56	2.98
	4.03	3.98	3.97	4.75	4.06
	<b>3.22</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>4.74</b>	<b>3.26</b>
	151	151	151	151	151
	Harrison, Catoe	Molly, Willging	Hassan, Zagloul	Bilal, Malas	Alissa, Balke
	61	41	60	62	17
	19	14	28	27	8
	31%	34%	47%	44%	47%
	3.93	4.58	4.72	3.67	4.25
	3.67	4.58	4.68	3.96	3.88
	4.52	5.00	4.70	4.09	2.50
	3.92	4.79	4.60	3.40	3.25
	3.80	4.08	4.48	3.17	2.00
	4.12	4.65	4.75	4.11	4.00
	<b>3.88</b>	<b>4.79</b>	<b>4.72</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>3.75</b>
	151	151	151	151	151
	Eric, Hammond	Jenni, Schimansk	Priya, Loganathar	Madison, Hankins	Roger, Daley
	61	102	65	61	102
	28	38	34	21	48
	46%	37%	52%	34%	47%
	2.35	3.97	3.31	4.56	4.62
	3.15	4.12	3.54	4.61	4.61
	3.60	4.18	3.03	4.61	4.65
	3.04	3.59	3.10	4.33	4.65
	3.54	3.99	3.54	4.28	3.99
	3.73	4.02	3.87	4.46	4.46
	<b>2.89</b>	<b>4.05</b>	<b>3.26</b>	<b>4.57</b>	<b>4.64</b>

	151	152	152	152	152
	Bailey, Murphy	Lindsey, Tiegs	Andrew, Zuehlke	Mauriel, Rodriguez Curras	David, Salmon
	33	43	22	43	43
	11	17	7	17	19
	33%	40%	32%	40%	44%
	3.97	4.18	4.86	4.00	4.56
	4.32	4.10	4.86	3.55	4.47
	4.49	4.01	4.86	4.32	4.58
	4.05	3.69	4.86	4.17	4.35
	4.04	4.10	4.57	2.17	4.29
	4.49	3.71	4.86	4.02	4.48
	<b>4.15</b>	<b>4.15</b>	<b>4.86</b>	<b>4.02</b>	<b>4.62</b>
	152	152	152	152	152
	Steven, Augustin	Khuram, Zaman	Julia, Handel	Carmel, Assa	Nathan, Kiel
	40	43	43	22	43
	22	21	18	11	14
	55%	49%	42%	50%	33%
	4.78	4.59	4.54	3.89	4.75
	4.71	4.31	4.65	4.00	4.82
	4.88	4.81	4.58	3.88	4.69
	4.94	4.59	4.37	3.88	4.82
	4.14	3.96	4.31	4.00	4.42
	4.81	4.17	4.47	4.00	4.63
	<b>4.87</b>	<b>4.69</b>	<b>4.65</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>4.88</b>
	152	152	152	152	152

	Kayla, Wandsnid	Lucas, Nell	Jade, Kochanski	Kartik, Singh	Michael, Bosch
	62	62	86	64	87
	29	26	39	29	33
	47%	42%	45%	45%	38%
	3.86	3.94	4.29	4.10	4.79
	4.11	4.13	4.31	4.31	4.68
	4.58	4.22	4.54	4.26	4.78
	3.88	3.24	3.98	3.68	4.42
	4.09	3.67	4.03	4.09	4.07
	4.22	4.39	4.26	4.36	4.35
	<b>3.94</b>	<b>4.02</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>4.73</b>
	316	316	316	410	430
	Emily, Whitaker	Adrianna, Gorsky	Linnea, Rock	Teresa, Popp	Jacki, Whisenant
	8	14	13	61	36
	3	8	3	14	16
	38%	57%	23%	23%	44%
	4.33	4.50	4.67	4.47	4.75
	3.67	4.38	4.67	4.30	4.65
	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.77	4.77
	4.67	4.38	4.67	4.27	4.65
	4.67	4.63	4.67	4.57	4.77
	4.67	4.38	4.67	4.48	4.75
	<b>4.67</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>4.67</b>	<b>4.72</b>	<b>4.80</b>

102							
Mary, Dinsmore							
53							
22							
42%							
4.66							
4.75							
4.61							
4.68							
4.63							
4.32							
<b>4.73</b>							
151							
Samantha, Vold							
60							
29							
48%							
2.98							
3.21							
3.89							
3.01							
2.38							
4.14							
<b>2.73</b>							
151	151	151					
Tyler, Wintermute	Nicole, Kuha	Caitlin, Conway					
63	35	54					

37	13	26					
59%	37%	48%					
3.78	4.77	4.24					
3.46	4.69	4.33					
4.23	4.77	4.04					
3.17	4.48	3.53					
2.27	4.70	4.00					
4.00	4.57	4.11					
<b>3.57</b>	<b>4.86</b>	<b>4.08</b>					
151	151						
Robert, Rosner	Ryan, Geygan						
96	100						
37	44						
39%	44%						
4.31	4.85						
4.49	4.61						
4.57	4.81						
4.13	4.78						
4.63	4.66						
4.65	4.64						
<b>4.42</b>	<b>4.87</b>						
151	151						
Laura, Judge	Kelly, Schmit						
55	37						
26	17						
47%	46%						
3.48	4.80						
4.24	4.85						
4.41	4.90						
3.71	4.75						
4.35	4.75						
4.40	4.85						
<b>4.06</b>	<b>4.90</b>						

152	152						
Megan, Morrison	Mitch, Buthod						
39	44						
19	21						
49%	48%						
4.73	4.17						
4.90	4.45						
4.49	4.15						
4.45	3.63						
4.39	3.87						
4.48	4.27						
<b>4.77</b>	<b>3.97</b>						
152	152						
Yi-Ming, Weng	Andrew, Bennett						
43	85						
20	42						
47%	49%						
4.32	4.11						
4.40	3.63						
4.78	4.27						
4.38	3.99						
4.21	2.90						
4.63	3.68						
<b>4.61</b>	<b>4.04</b>						
153	153						

Eric, Hammond	Kelly, Schmit						
48	19						
15	10						
31%	53%						
<b>3.10</b>	<b>4.70</b>						
3.10							
3.62	4.90						
3.62	4.11						
3.82	4.70						
3.82	4.80						
<b>3.29</b>	<b>4.50</b>						
430	523	523	555	570	570		
Aaron, Kufner	Julio, Diaz	Brooke, Aschbach	Zachary, Swider	Ani, Michaud	Ani, Michaud		
36	357	357	13	72	72		
16	107	107	4	25	25		
44%	30%	30%	31%	35%	35%		
<b>4.67</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>4.75</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>4.17</b>		
4.49	3.68	3.73	4.75	4.28	4.23		
4.85	3.83	3.70	5.00	4.16	4.23		
4.57	3.61	3.53	4.75	4.20	4.18		
4.77	3.57	3.61	4.75	4.28	4.23		
4.80	3.90	3.92	4.50	4.40	4.32		
<b>4.80</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>4.75</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>4.23</b>		



























The image displays a table with a grid of 20 columns and 20 rows. A thick, dark grey vertical line is positioned in the 13th column from the left, extending from the top to the bottom of the grid. The grid lines are thin and grey, while the vertical line is significantly thicker and darker.












































