

Course-Section: BTEC 650 8010  
 Title APPLIED BIOCHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: WOOD, TIMOTHY I  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 236  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	3	12	4.69	408/1649	4.69	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	487/1648	4.56	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	629/1375	4.44	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	428/1595	4.56	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	225/1533	4.69	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	735/1512	4.21	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	8	7	4.31	744/1623	4.31	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	483/1621	4.43	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	287/1568	4.88	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.82	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	741/1564	4.44	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	561/1559	4.63	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.91	3.98	4.10	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	708/1384	4.20	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	905/1382	4.13	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	796/1368	4.33	4.43	4.30	4.56	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	591/ 948	3.78	4.24	3.95	4.03	3.78
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 243	****	4.43	4.12	4.61	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.50	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 92	****	4.13	4.35	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.87	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.18	4.06	4.51	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.40	4.47	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.62	4.38	4.44	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.83	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 53	****	3.67	4.30	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 110	****	4.00	3.99	3.92	****

Course-Section: BTEC 650 8010  
 Title APPLIED BIOCHEMISTRY  
 Instructor: WOOD, TIMOTHY I  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 236  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	3.11	1585/1648	3.11	4.35	4.23	4.34	3.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1150/1375	3.67	4.38	4.27	4.44	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1335/1595	3.67	4.38	4.20	4.35	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1345/1512	3.33	4.35	4.10	4.35	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1555/1621	2.80	4.07	4.06	4.20	2.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1145/1568	4.22	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	1	2	3.33	1441/1564	3.33	4.29	4.28	4.41	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1322/1559	3.67	4.34	4.29	4.41	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	1160/1352	3.25	3.91	3.98	4.10	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	953/1384	3.78	4.39	4.08	4.30	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1038/1382	3.89	4.49	4.29	4.52	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	0	1	1	4	3.33	1229/1368	3.33	4.43	4.30	4.56	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	894/ 948	2.75	4.24	3.95	4.03	2.75	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 243	****	4.43	4.12	4.61	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.13	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.18	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.40	4.47	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.62	4.38	4.44	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.67	4.30	4.37	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	8
?	1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	238/1649	4.85	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	614/1648	4.46	4.35	4.23	4.34	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	908/1375	4.11	4.38	4.27	4.44	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	685/1595	4.36	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	198/1533	4.73	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	416/1623	4.58	4.22	4.16	4.29	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.85	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	859/1621	4.10	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	461/1568	4.77	4.50	4.43	4.52	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	473/1572	4.92	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	537/1564	4.62	4.29	4.28	4.41	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	573/1559	4.62	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	258/1352	4.58	3.91	3.98	4.10	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	418/1384	4.54	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	593/1382	4.54	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	327/1368	4.85	4.43	4.30	4.56	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	249/ 948	4.44	4.24	3.95	4.03	4.44	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.13	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.18	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.50	4.09	4.47	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.40	4.47	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.62	4.38	4.44	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.67	4.30	4.37	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: BTEC 670 8010  
 Title LEGAL AND ETHICAL ISSU  
 Instructor: PROVORNY, FREDE  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 239  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	3	5	4.44	723/1649	4.44	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1408/1648	3.67	4.35	4.23	4.34	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	672/1595	4.38	4.38	4.20	4.35	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	168/1533	4.78	4.01	4.04	4.28	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	179/1512	4.78	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	3	0	2	2	1	2.75	1579/1623	2.75	4.22	4.16	4.29	2.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	881/1646	4.78	4.85	4.69	4.81	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	835/1621	4.13	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1354/1568	3.89	4.50	4.43	4.52	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.82	4.70	4.83	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1336/1564	3.67	4.29	4.28	4.41	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	640/1559	4.56	4.34	4.29	4.41	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1352	****	3.91	3.98	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	406/1384	4.56	4.39	4.08	4.30	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	403/1368	4.78	4.43	4.30	4.56	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	4.24	3.95	4.03	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.50	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.13	4.35	4.42	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.67	4.30	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

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