

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	BTEC 650 01
Title:	Applied Biochemistry
Instructor:	Wood,Timothy I.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	13

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	206/1528	4.85	4.40	4.31	4.45	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	639/1527	4.46	4.27	4.28	4.36	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	447/1333	4.62	4.22	4.34	4.39	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	576/1495	4.45	4.16	4.25	4.33	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	213/1439	4.69	3.99	4.11	4.24	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	454/1425	4.45	4.02	4.12	4.28	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	448/1508	4.50	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.83	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	734/1490	4.20	4.09	4.11	4.16	4.20
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	177/1428	4.92	4.60	4.49	4.56	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	742/1436	4.83	4.78	4.74	4.83	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	683/1427	4.46	4.32	4.32	4.36	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	726/1425	4.46	4.39	4.34	4.34	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	267/1291	4.58	4.21	4.05	3.99	4.58
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	549/1271	4.40	4.04	4.16	4.27	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	837/1276	4.20	4.27	4.33	4.43	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	562/1273	4.60	4.33	4.38	4.52	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	467/922	4.00	4.00	4.02	4.00	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	BTEC 650 01
Title:	Applied Biochemistry
Instructor:	Wood,Timothy I.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	13

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

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 4	A 6	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 4 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 9 Non-major 13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 3		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	BTEC 653 01
Title:	Bioprocess Engineering
Instructor:	Ahuja, Sanjeev K

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	506/1528	4.62	4.40	4.31	4.45	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	489/1527	4.57	4.27	4.28	4.36	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	415/1333	4.64	4.22	4.34	4.39	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	682/1495	4.38	4.16	4.25	4.33	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	472/1439	4.43	3.99	4.11	4.24	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	367/1425	4.54	4.02	4.12	4.28	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	448/1508	4.50	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.83	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	911/1490	4.00	4.09	4.11	4.16	4.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	177/1428	4.93	4.60	4.49	4.56	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	413/1436	4.93	4.78	4.74	4.83	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	625/1427	4.50	4.32	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	633/1425	4.54	4.39	4.34	4.34	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	275/1291	4.57	4.21	4.05	3.99	4.57
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	701/1271	4.17	4.04	4.16	4.27	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	523/1276	4.58	4.27	4.33	4.43	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	408/1273	4.75	4.33	4.38	4.52	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	408/922	4.17	4.00	4.02	4.00	4.17

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	BTEC 653 01
Title:	Bioprocess Engineering
Instructor:	Ahuja, Sanjeev K

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/76	****	4.80	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/74	****	4.75	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/76	****	4.80	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	4.40	3.94	3.81	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.86	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	4.17	4.53	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.64	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: BTEC 653 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 16
Title: Bioprocess Engineering		Questionnaires: 14
Instructor: Ahuja, Sanjeev K		

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

	I	0	Other		0
	?	1			

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	BTEC 665 01
Title:	Mgmt. Leadership & Comm.
Instructor:	Izenberg, Illysa

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	8	12	4.26	908/1528	4.26	4.40	4.31	4.45	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	550/1527	4.52	4.27	4.28	4.36	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	393/1333	4.67	4.22	4.34	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	15	4.48	544/1495	4.48	4.16	4.25	4.33	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	15	4.48	406/1439	4.48	3.99	4.11	4.24	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	377/1425	4.52	4.02	4.12	4.28	4.52
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	7	13	4.30	722/1508	4.30	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	21	4.86	636/1526	4.86	4.83	4.66	4.81	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	698/1490	4.23	4.09	4.11	4.16	4.23
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	830/1428	4.52	4.60	4.49	4.56	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	258/1436	4.96	4.78	4.74	4.83	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	506/1427	4.61	4.32	4.32	4.36	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	14	4.43	770/1425	4.43	4.39	4.34	4.34	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	496/1291	4.32	4.21	4.05	3.99	4.32
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	413/1271	4.55	4.04	4.16	4.27	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	2	17	4.67	439/1276	4.67	4.27	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	1	18	4.59	569/1273	4.59	4.33	4.38	4.52	4.59
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	4	8	7	4.00	467/922	4.00	4.00	4.02	4.00	4.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	BTEC 665 01
Title:	Mgmt. Leadership & Comm.
Instructor:	Izenberg, Illysa

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	25
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/208	****	4.42	4.27	4.40	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.01	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	30/43	4.17	4.17	4.43	4.43	4.17
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	25/31	4.17	4.17	4.53	4.67	4.17
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	27/36	4.00	4.00	4.43	4.54	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.64	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	5	A	15	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	3						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	BTEC 680 01
Title:	Financial Management
Instructor:	Peterson,Sandra

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	578/1528	4.56	4.40	4.31	4.45	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	575/1527	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.36	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	393/1333	4.67	4.22	4.34	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	544/1495	4.47	4.16	4.25	4.33	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	520/1439	4.39	3.99	4.11	4.24	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	543/1425	4.38	4.02	4.12	4.28	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	489/1508	4.47	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	340/1526	4.94	4.83	4.66	4.81	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	266/1490	4.60	4.09	4.11	4.16	4.60
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	534/1428	4.72	4.60	4.49	4.56	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.78	4.74	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	792/1427	4.39	4.32	4.32	4.36	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	393/1425	4.72	4.39	4.34	4.34	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	395/1291	4.44	4.21	4.05	3.99	4.44
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	357/1271	4.61	4.04	4.16	4.27	4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	439/1276	4.67	4.27	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	382/1273	4.78	4.33	4.38	4.52	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	284/922	4.39	4.00	4.02	4.00	4.39



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	BTEC 680 01
Title:	Financial Management
Instructor:	Peterson,Sandra

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	4.46	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/208	****	4.42	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.69	4.56	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/194	****	4.46	4.37	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.17	4.23	4.66	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/76	****	4.80	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/74	****	4.75	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	5.00	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/76	****	4.80	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	4.40	3.94	3.81	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.01	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.36	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/43	****	4.17	4.43	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/31	****	4.17	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/36	****	4.00	4.43	4.54	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	BTEC 680 01
Title:	Financial Management
Instructor:	Peterson,Sandra

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	28
Questionnaires:	27

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.64	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	7	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	7	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	13						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	BTEC 685 01
Title:	Proj. Man. Fundamentals
Instructor:	Griner, Anita E.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	40
Questionnaires:	33

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	10	22	4.64	477/1528	4.64	4.40	4.31	4.45	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	21	4.61	453/1527	4.61	4.27	4.28	4.36	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	9	18	4.27	816/1333	4.27	4.22	4.34	4.39	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	16	16	4.45	576/1495	4.45	4.16	4.25	4.33	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	13	17	4.36	541/1439	4.36	3.99	4.11	4.24	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	15	14	4.34	573/1425	4.34	4.02	4.12	4.28	4.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	19	13	4.36	640/1508	4.36	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	227/1526	4.97	4.83	4.66	4.81	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	14	18	4.52	336/1490	4.52	4.09	4.11	4.16	4.52
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	4.70	588/1428	4.70	4.60	4.49	4.56	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	709/1436	4.85	4.78	4.74	4.83	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	14	16	4.41	772/1427	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.36	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	10	21	4.55	622/1425	4.55	4.39	4.34	4.34	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	11	18	4.52	319/1291	4.52	4.21	4.05	3.99	4.52

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	26	0.00-0.99	2	A	24	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	33
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: BTEC 685 01	Term - Fall 2010	Enrollment: 40
Title: Proj. Man. Fundamentals		Questionnaires: 33
Instructor: Griner, Anita E.		

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

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	14	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant						
				P	0									
				I	0	Other	0							
				?	1									

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	BTEC 690 01
Title:	Innov & Tech Entrepreneuru
Instructor:	Kirk,Julia L.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	265/1528	4.79	4.40	4.31	4.45	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	489/1527	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.36	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	532/1333	4.53	4.22	4.34	4.39	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	247/1495	4.74	4.16	4.25	4.33	4.74
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	367/1439	4.50	3.99	4.11	4.24	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	320/1425	4.59	4.02	4.12	4.28	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	220/1508	4.72	4.13	4.18	4.25	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1526	5.00	4.83	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	266/1490	4.60	4.09	4.11	4.16	4.60
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	515/1428	4.74	4.60	4.49	4.56	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	310/1436	4.95	4.78	4.74	4.83	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	202/1427	4.83	4.32	4.32	4.36	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	542/1425	4.61	4.39	4.34	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	161/1291	4.72	4.21	4.05	3.99	4.72
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	357/1271	4.61	4.04	4.16	4.27	4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	591/1276	4.50	4.27	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	445/1273	4.72	4.33	4.38	4.52	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	164/922	4.65	4.00	4.02	4.00	4.65

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	BTEC 690 01
Title:	Innov & Tech Entrepreneur
Instructor:	Kirk, Julia L.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/198	****	4.46	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/208	****	4.42	4.27	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.69	4.56	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/194	****	4.46	4.37	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/176	****	4.17	4.23	4.66	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/76	****	4.80	4.51	4.51	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/74	****	4.75	4.31	4.32	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/66	****	5.00	4.27	4.44	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/76	****	4.80	4.27	4.33	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/73	****	4.40	3.94	3.81	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/42	****	****	4.00	3.86	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/41	****	****	4.06	4.01	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.74	4.95	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/32	****	****	4.20	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/29	****	****	4.34	4.36	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/43	****	4.17	4.43	4.43	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/31	****	4.17	4.53	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/36	****	4.00	4.43	4.54	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	BTEC 690 01
Title:	Innov & Tech Entrepreneur
Instructor:	Kirk, Julia L.

Term - Fall 2010

Enrollment:	21
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/21	****	****	4.54	4.68	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/20	****	****	4.45	4.64	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	9	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						