

Course-Section: BTEC 651 8010
 Title MOLEC. AND CELL BIOLOG
 Instructor: WAGNER, CYNTHIA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 244
 AUG 6, 2008
 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 363/1670 | 4.75 | 4.51 | 4.31 | 4.46 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4.14 | 1092/1666 | 4.14 | 4.52 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.14 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.86 | 1158/1406 | 3.86 | 4.52 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 3.86 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | 1083/1615 | 4.00 | 4.45 | 4.24 | 4.33 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 324/1566 | 4.63 | 4.39 | 4.07 | 4.20 | 4.63 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4.38 | 590/1528 | 4.38 | 4.40 | 4.12 | 4.33 | 4.38 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.38 | 757/1650 | 4.38 | 4.51 | 4.22 | 4.30 | 4.38 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 730/1667 | 4.88 | 4.86 | 4.67 | 4.74 | 4.88 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 3.83 | 1191/1626 | 3.83 | 4.34 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 3.83 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.63 | 1442/1559 | 3.63 | 4.65 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 3.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 4.25 | 1411/1560 | 4.25 | 4.87 | 4.72 | 4.81 | 4.25 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3.63 | 1358/1549 | 3.63 | 4.48 | 4.31 | 4.37 | 3.63 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 265/1546 | 4.88 | 4.51 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.88 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.38 | 448/1323 | 4.38 | 4.13 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 4.38 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 356/1384 | 4.63 | 4.63 | 4.10 | 4.21 | 4.63 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1378 | 5.00 | 4.75 | 4.29 | 4.42 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 312/1378 | 4.88 | 4.89 | 4.31 | 4.51 | 4.88 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 243/ 904 | 4.50 | 4.22 | 4.03 | 4.04 | 4.50 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 87 | **** | 4.95 | 4.65 | 4.61 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 75 | **** | 4.97 | 4.57 | 4.66 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 79 | **** | 4.72 | 4.45 | 4.58 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.22 | 3.97 | 4.32 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 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 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 7 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 4 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 7 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: BTEC 680 8010
 Title FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: PETERSON, SANDR
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 245
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----|------------|---|--------|------|------|-------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 4.26 | 985/1670 | 4.26 | 4.51 | 4.31 | 4.46 | 4.26 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 4.16 | 1081/1666 | 4.16 | 4.52 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.16 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4.50 | 597/1406 | 4.50 | 4.52 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 4.22 | 910/1615 | 4.22 | 4.45 | 4.24 | 4.33 | 4.22 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 4.37 | 530/1566 | 4.37 | 4.39 | 4.07 | 4.20 | 4.37 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 4.11 | 842/1528 | 4.11 | 4.40 | 4.12 | 4.33 | 4.11 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 4.26 | 891/1650 | 4.26 | 4.51 | 4.22 | 4.30 | 4.26 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1667 | 5.00 | 4.86 | 4.67 | 4.74 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 3.88 | 1143/1626 | 3.88 | 4.34 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 3.88 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 4.05 | 1268/1559 | 4.05 | 4.65 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.05 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 4.95 | 358/1560 | 4.95 | 4.87 | 4.72 | 4.81 | 4.95 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 3.89 | 1241/1549 | 3.89 | 4.48 | 4.31 | 4.37 | 3.89 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 4.06 | 1121/1546 | 4.06 | 4.51 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.06 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 8 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 3.67 | 960/1323 | 3.67 | 4.13 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 3.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4.12 | 786/1384 | 4.12 | 4.63 | 4.10 | 4.21 | 4.12 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 4.71 | 452/1378 | 4.71 | 4.75 | 4.29 | 4.42 | 4.71 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 4.76 | 428/1378 | 4.76 | 4.89 | 4.31 | 4.51 | 4.76 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 10 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.11 | 817/ 904 | 3.11 | 4.22 | 4.03 | 4.04 | 3.11 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 24 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 232 | **** | 3.79 | 4.19 | 4.30 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 239 | **** | 4.02 | 4.21 | 4.53 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 230 | **** | 4.14 | 4.44 | 4.69 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 231 | **** | 4.44 | 4.31 | 4.58 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 218 | **** | 4.25 | 4.18 | 4.47 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 87 | **** | 4.95 | 4.65 | 4.61 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 79 | **** | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.67 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 75 | **** | 4.97 | 4.57 | 4.66 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 79 | **** | 4.72 | 4.45 | 4.58 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.22 | 3.97 | 4.32 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | 3.67 | 4.50 | 4.65 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 38 | **** | **** | 4.19 | 4.58 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 38 | **** | **** | 4.62 | 4.65 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 39 | **** | **** | 4.27 | 4.59 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | **** | 4.47 | 4.59 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 28 | **** | **** | 4.64 | 4.82 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 16 | **** | **** | 4.67 | 4.60 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | ****/ 27 | **** | **** | 4.54 | 4.67 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 10 | **** | **** | 4.84 | 4.90 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 6 | **** | **** | 4.92 | 5.00 | **** |

Course-Section: BTEC 680 8010
 Title FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: PETERSON, SANDR
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 245
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | Type | Majors | | | |
|----------------|----|-----------|---|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 10 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 10 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 3 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 15 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 10 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 12 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |