

Course-Section: BTEC 650 8010
 Title Applied Biochemistry
 Instructor: Wood, Timothy
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 2
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job I RBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	517/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	517/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1532	****	4.07	4.01	3.88	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	824/1504	****	4.14	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	490/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	569/1579	****	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	454/1518	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	****	4.76	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1083/1517	****	4.43	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	638/1550	****	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1295	****	4.31	3.94	3.84	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	770/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	816/1391	****	4.60	4.30	4.07	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	647/1388	****	4.53	4.28	4.01	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	****	4.39	3.93	3.71	4.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	234/ 240	****	2.70	4.11	4.01	1.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	****	4.74	4.58	4.50	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 82	****	4.15	4.52	4.12	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	****	4.71	4.47	4.25	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	****	4.72	4.47	4.39	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	49/ 82	****	4.14	4.16	3.90	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	48/ 52	****	3.07	4.04	3.61	1.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	52/ 53	****	3.00	4.05	3.51	1.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 42	****	4.67	4.75	4.79	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	32/ 32	****	4.33	4.56	4.60	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	****	4.07	4.45	4.54	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	****	4.50	4.51	4.67	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	****	4.20	4.69	4.69	5.00	

Course-Section: BTEC 650 8010
 Title Applied Biochemistry
 Instructor: Wood, Timothy
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 2
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						