

Course-Section: BTEC 651 01
 Title Molec. And Cell Biolog
 Instructor: Craig,Nessly C
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 204
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	7	7	3	0	2.67	1436/1447	2.67	4.48	4.31	4.46	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	5	4	3	1	2.44	1434/1447	2.44	4.28	4.27	4.30	2.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	4	4	3	2	1	2.43	1232/1241	2.43	4.26	4.33	4.38	2.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	2	8	1	1	2.39	1394/1402	2.39	4.27	4.24	4.29	2.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	6	3	3.22	1257/1358	3.22	4.09	4.11	4.26	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	5	5	4	1	2.82	1277/1316	2.82	4.13	4.14	4.34	2.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	11	3	1	0	3	1.94	1421/1427	1.94	4.22	4.19	4.25	1.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	978/1447	4.65	4.75	4.69	4.74	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	5	6	4	1	0	2.06	1424/1434	2.06	4.03	4.10	4.21	2.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	7	5	2	3.22	1335/1387	3.22	4.48	4.46	4.51	3.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	1344/1387	3.83	4.70	4.73	4.81	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	3	7	2	2	2.72	1351/1386	2.72	4.28	4.32	4.43	2.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	6	2	3	1	2.28	1366/1380	2.28	4.38	4.32	4.38	2.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	5	3	4	4	2	2.72	1140/1193	2.72	4.14	4.02	4.02	2.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	4	5	2	2.89	1121/1172	2.89	4.14	4.15	4.32	2.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	788/1182	4.17	4.29	4.35	4.46	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	6	6	3	3.44	1088/1170	3.44	4.34	4.38	4.52	3.44
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	2	0	4	8	3	3.59	635/ 800	3.59	4.20	4.06	4.10	3.59
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.68	4.34	4.79	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	4.39	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	4.56	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****

Course-Section: BTEC 651 01
 Title Molec. And Cell Biolog
 Instructor: Craig, Nessly C
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 204
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: BTEC 662 01
 Title Gmp's For Bioprocesses
 Instructor: Moreira, Antonio (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 205
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.26	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.27	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.09	4.11	4.26	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.13	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.22	4.19	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.75	4.69	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	230/1434	4.17	4.03	4.10	4.21	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.83	4.48	4.46	4.51	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.67	4.70	4.73	4.81	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	4.50	4.28	4.32	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	186/1193	4.00	4.14	4.02	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	282/1172	4.67	4.14	4.15	4.32	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1182	4.67	4.29	4.35	4.46	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.52	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.77	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	24/ 36	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.39	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.85	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.65	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.59	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.56	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.80	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	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	2	Non-major	4
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	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.26	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.27	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.09	4.11	4.26	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.13	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.22	4.19	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.75	4.69	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1150/1434	4.17	4.03	4.10	4.21	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	566/1387	4.83	4.48	4.46	4.51	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1229/1387	4.67	4.70	4.73	4.81	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1047/1386	4.50	4.28	4.32	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.38	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1022/1193	4.00	4.14	4.02	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	282/1172	4.67	4.14	4.15	4.32	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1182	4.67	4.29	4.35	4.46	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.52	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.77	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	24/ 36	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.39	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.72	4.85	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.65	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.59	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.56	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.80	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	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	2	Non-major	4
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	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	59/1447	4.96	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	89/1447	4.92	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	159/1241	4.88	4.26	4.33	4.38	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	22	4.77	207/1402	4.77	4.27	4.24	4.29	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	97/1358	4.88	4.09	4.11	4.26	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	107/1316	4.85	4.13	4.14	4.34	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	99/1427	4.88	4.22	4.19	4.25	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	948/1447	4.68	4.75	4.69	4.74	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	296/1434	4.58	4.03	4.10	4.21	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	160/1387	4.92	4.48	4.46	4.51	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	422/1387	4.92	4.70	4.73	4.81	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	55/1386	4.96	4.28	4.32	4.43	4.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	127/1380	4.92	4.38	4.32	4.38	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	349/1193	4.43	4.14	4.02	4.02	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	6	18	4.60	323/1172	4.60	4.14	4.15	4.32	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	79/1182	4.96	4.29	4.35	4.46	4.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	377/1170	4.76	4.34	4.38	4.52	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	2	2	17	4.59	162/ 800	4.59	4.20	4.06	4.10	4.59
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.74	4.34	4.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 192	****	4.68	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 186	****	4.70	4.48	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 187	****	4.67	4.33	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 168	****	4.48	4.20	4.55	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.00	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 62	****	4.00	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.50	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.50	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	3.50	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.71	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.59	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	4.56	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****

Course-Section: BTEC 680 01
 Title Financial Management
 Instructor: Peterson, Sandra
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 207
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	20	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						