**Course-Section: BTEC 650 01** 

**Term - Fall 2011** 

**Enrollment: 16** 

**Title: Applied Biochemistry** 

**Instructor:** Wood, Timothy I.

|   | _  | IR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean           0         0         0         1         2         0         7         4.30           0         0         0         0         0         4         6         4.60           0         0         0         0         3         2         5         4.20           0         0         0         1         3         0         6         4.10           0         0         0         0         2         2         6         4.40           0         1         0         1         2         1         5         4.11           0         0         0         0         0         2         8         4.80           0         0         0         0         0         10         5.00           3         0         0         0         0         3         4         4.57 |   |   |   |   | structor | Course | Org      | <b>UMBC</b> | Level | Sect |      |      |
|---|----|--|---|---|---|---|----------|--------|----------|-------------|-------|------|------|------|
| Questions   | 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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7        | 4.30   | 874/1520 | 4.30        | 4.48  | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.30 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6        | 4.60   | 443/1520 | 4.60        | 4.31  | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5        | 4.20   | 851/1291 | 4.20        | 4.28  | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.20 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6        | 4.10   | 960/1483 | 4.10        | 4.15  | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.10 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6        | 4.40   | 473/1417 | 4.40        | 4.16  | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.40 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0  | 1  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5        | 4.11   | 784/1405 | 4.11        | 4.03  | 4.12 | 4.24 | 4.11 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8        | 4.80   | 148/1504 | 4.80        | 4.22  | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.80 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10       | 5.00   | 1/1519   | 5.00        | 4.86  | 4.70 | 4.77 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4        | 4.57   | 288/1495 | 4.57        | 4.15  | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.57 |
| Lecture   |    |  |   |   |   |   |          |        |          |             |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9        | 4.90   | 199/1459 | 4.90        | 4.60  | 4.47 | 4.48 | 4.90 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9        | 4.90   | 544/1460 | 4.90        | 4.79  | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5        | 4.50   | 637/1455 | 4.50        | 4.32  | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6        | 4.60   | 579/1456 | 4.60        | 4.37  | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1  | 0  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6        | 4.11   | 659/1316 | 4.11        | 4.21  | 4.03 | 3.86 | 4.11 |
| Discussion  |    |  |   |   |   |   |          |        |          |             | ,     |      |      |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4        | 4.25   | 624/1243 | 4.25        | 3.87  | 4.17 | 4.23 | 4.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5        | 4.33   | 713/1241 | 4.33        | 4.25  | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.33 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6        | 4.56   | 606/1236 | 4.56        | 4.33  | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.56 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 2  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4        | 4.43   | 241/889  | 4.43        | 3.98  | 4.02 | 4.06 | 4.43 |

**Course-Section: BTEC 650 01** 

**Term - Fall 2011** 

Enrollment: 16

Title: Applied Biochemistry

**Instructor:** Wood, Timothy I.

|  |    |    |   | Fre | quen | cies |   | Ins  | structor | Course | Org  | <b>UMBC</b> | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Questions  | NR | NA | 1 | 2   | 3    | 4    | 5 | Mean | Rank     | Mean   | Mean | Mean        | Mean  | Mean |
| Laboratory   |    |    |   |     |      |      |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 1    | 0 | 4.00 | ****/160 | ****   | 4.80 | 4.45        | 3.91  | **** |
| Seminar  |    |    |   |     |      |      |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  | 8  | 1  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67  | ****   | 4.33 | 4.60        | 4.62  | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/66  | ****   | 4.80 | 4.55        | 4.62  | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned  | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 1    | 0 | 4.00 | ****/62  | ****   | 4.60 | 4.54        | 4.59  | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned      | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 1    | 0 | 4.00 | ****/68  | ****   | **** | 4.59        | 4.62  | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                  | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/66  | ****   | 3.40 | 4.20        | 4.26  | **** |
| Field Work   |    |    |   |     |      |      |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned   | 9  | 0  | 1 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 0 | 1.00 | ****/32  | ****   | **** | 4.36        | 4.44  | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities   | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/20  | ****   | **** | 4.23        | 4.52  | **** |
| Self Paced   |    |    |   |     |      |      |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  | 8  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 1    | 0    | 1 | 4.00 | ****/24  | ****   | 4.00 | 4.17        | 4.13  | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal      | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15  | ****   | 4.20 | 4.17        | 4.48  | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful         | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15  | ****   | 3.80 | 4.06        | 4.90  | **** |

Course-Section: BTEC 650 01

Title: Applied Biochemistry

Instructor: Wood,Timothy I.

|  |    |    |   | Fre | quend | cies |   | Ins  | structor | Course | Org  | <b>UMBC</b> | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|---|-----|-------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Questions  | NR | NA | 1 | 2   | 3     | 4    | 5 | Mean | Rank     | Mean   | Mean | Mean        | Mean  | Mean |
| Self Paced   |    |    |   |     |       |      |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 9  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0     | 1    | 0 | 4.00 | ****/12  | ****   | 4.40 | 4.16        | 4.68  | **** |

## **Frequency Distribution**

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GP/  | A | Expected | Grades | Reasons             |   | Туре              |             | Majors           |    |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|-------------------|-------------|------------------|----|
| 00-27     | 0     | 0.00-0.99 | 1 | Α        | 6      | Required for Majors | 7 | Graduate          | 5           | Major            | 0  |
| 28-55     | 0     | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В        | 1      |                     |   |                   |             |                  |    |
| 56-83     | 0     | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С        | 0      | General             | 0 | Under-grad        | 5           | Non-major        | 10 |
| 84-150    | 0     | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D        | 0      |                     |   |                   |             |                  |    |
| Grad.     | 5     | 3.50-4.00 | 0 | F        | 0      | Electives           | 0 | **** - Means the  | ere are not | enough responses |    |
|           |       |           |   | Р        | 0      |                     |   | to be significant | t           |                  |    |
|           |       |           |   | I        | 0      | Other               | 0 |                   |             |                  |    |
|           |       |           |   | ?        | 3      |                     |   |                   |             |                  |    |

**Enrollment: 16** 

**Course-Section: BTEC 653 01** 

**Term - Fall 2011** 

**Enrollment: 13** 

**Title: Bioprocess Engineering** 

**Instructor:** Ahuja, Sanjeev K

|   | 1 0 1 0 2 4 5 4.00 999/1504 1 0 1 0 0 0 11 4.67 956/1519 s 6 0 0 0 0 5 2 4.29 627/1495  1 0 0 0 1 1 1 10 4.75 463/1459 |    |   |   |   | Course | Org | UMBC | Level     | Sect |      |      |      |      |
|---|--|----|---|---|---|--------|-----|------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Questions   | 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 | 5      | 7   | 4.46 | 666/1520  | 4.46 | 4.48 | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.46 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5      | 7   | 4.31 | 847/1520  | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.31 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 1  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1      | 7   | 4.36 | 730/1291  | 4.36 | 4.28 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.36 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4      | 4   | 4.09 | 965/1483  | 4.09 | 4.15 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.09 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 1  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6      | 4   | 4.27 | 596/1417  | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.27 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1  | 2  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2      | 6   | 4.30 | 605/1405  | 4.30 | 4.03 | 4.12 | 4.24 | 4.30 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1  | 0  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4      | 5   | 4.00 | 999/1504  | 4.00 | 4.22 | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1  | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0      | 11  | 4.67 | 956/1519  | 4.67 | 4.86 | 4.70 | 4.77 | 4.67 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5      | 2   | 4.29 | 627/1495  | 4.29 | 4.15 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.29 |
| Lecture   |  |    |   |   |   |        |     |      |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1      | 10  | 4.75 | 463/1459  | 4.75 | 4.60 | 4.47 | 4.48 | 4.75 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0  | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3      | 9   | 4.46 | 1224/1460 | 4.46 | 4.79 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.46 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 3  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3      | 5   | 4.30 | 877/1455  | 4.30 | 4.32 | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.30 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 2  | 0  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1      | 8   | 4.36 | 832/1456  | 4.36 | 4.37 | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.36 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 2  | 1  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3      | 4   | 3.80 | 889/1316  | 3.80 | 4.21 | 4.03 | 3.86 | 3.80 |
| Discussion  |  |    |   |   |   |        |     |      |           |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 3  | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6      | 2   | 3.90 | 849/1243  | 3.90 | 3.87 | 4.17 | 4.23 | 3.90 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 2  | 0  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4      | 3   | 3.82 | 1031/1241 | 3.82 | 4.25 | 4.33 | 4.39 | 3.82 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 2  | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4      | 5   | 4.18 | 865/1236  | 4.18 | 4.33 | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.18 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 2  | 3  | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2      | 1   | 3.25 | 778/889   | 3.25 | 3.98 | 4.02 | 4.06 | 3.25 |

**Course-Section: BTEC 653 01** 

**Term - Fall 2011** 

**Enrollment: 13** 

**Title: Bioprocess Engineering** 

**Questionnaires: 13** 

**Instructor:** Ahuja, Sanjeev K

|   |    |    |   | Fre | quen | cies |   | Ins  | structor | Course | Org  | <b>UMBC</b> | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Questions   | NR | NA | 1 | 2   | 3    | 4    | 5 | Mean | Rank     | Mean   | Mean | Mean        | Mean  | Mean |
| Laboratory  |    |    |   |     |      |      |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/164 | ****   | 4.63 | 4.15        | 3.66  | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/165 | ****   | 4.58 | 4.19        | 3.75  | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/160 | ****   | 4.80 | 4.45        | 3.91  | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/158 | ****   | 4.71 | 4.36        | 3.59  | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/150 | ****   | 4.49 | 4.05        | 3.71  | **** |
| Seminar   |    |    |   |     |      |      |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/67  | ****   | 4.33 | 4.60        | 4.62  | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/66  | ****   | 4.80 | 4.55        | 4.62  | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/62  | ****   | 4.60 | 4.54        | 4.59  | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/68  | ****   | **** | 4.59        | 4.62  | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/66  | ****   | 3.40 | 4.20        | 4.26  | **** |
| Field Work  |    |    |   |     |      |      |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/32  | ****   | **** | 4.36        | 4.44  | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/31  | ****   | **** | 4.15        | 4.39  | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/23  | ****   | 5.00 | 4.48        | 4.56  | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/27  | ****   | 4.60 | 4.23        | 4.32  | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/20  | ****   | **** | 4.23        | 4.52  | **** |

Run Date: 1/31/2012 11:01:26 AM

Course-Section: BTEC 653 01

Title: Bioprocess Engineering

Instructor: Ahuja,Sanjeev K

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment: 13

**Questionnaires: 13** 

|  |    |    |   | Fre | quen | cies |   | In   | structor | Course | Org  | <b>UMBC</b> | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Questions  | NR | NA | 1 | 2   | 3    | 4    | 5 | Mean | Rank     | Mean   | Mean | Mean        | Mean  | Mean |
| Self Paced                                       |    |    |   |     |      |      |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 12 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 1 | 5.00 | ****/15  | ****   | 3.80 | 4.06        | 4.90  | **** |

## **Frequency Distribution**

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GP/  | 4 | Expected | Grades | Reasons             |   | Туре             |             | Majors           |    |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|------------------|-------------|------------------|----|
| 00-27     | 4     | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | Α        | 5      | Required for Majors | 8 | Graduate         | 2           | Major            | 0  |
| 28-55     | 0     | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В        | 4      |                     |   |                  |             |                  |    |
| 56-83     | 0     | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С        | 0      | General             | 0 | Under-grad       | 11          | Non-major        | 13 |
| 84-150    | 0     | 3.00-3.49 | 0 | D        | 0      |                     |   |                  |             |                  |    |
| Grad.     | 2     | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F        | 0      | Electives           | 0 | **** - Means the | ere are not | enough responses |    |
|           |       |           |   | Р        | 0      |                     |   | to be significan | t           |                  |    |
|           |       |           |   | I        | 0      | Other               | 0 |                  |             |                  |    |
|           |       |           |   | ?        | 4      |                     |   |                  |             |                  |    |

**Course-Section: BTEC 660 01** 

**Term - Fall 2011** 

Enrollment: 31

iide.

Title: Reg. Issues In Biotech

**Questionnaires: 21** 

**Instructor:** Moreira, Antonio

|   |    |    |   | Fre | quen | cies |    | Ins  | structor | Course | Org  | <b>UMBC</b> | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|----|------|----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Questions   | 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    | 4    | 17 | 4.81 | 230/1520 | 4.81   | 4.48 | 4.31        | 4.39  | 4.81 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 1    | 3    | 17 | 4.76 | 237/1520 | 4.76   | 4.31 | 4.27        | 4.28  | 4.76 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0   | 3    | 4    | 13 | 4.50 | 546/1291 | 4.50   | 4.28 | 4.33        | 4.38  | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 3    | 17 | 4.85 | 138/1483 | 4.85   | 4.15 | 4.23        | 4.25  | 4.85 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 4    | 5    | 12 | 4.38 | 492/1417 | 4.38   | 4.16 | 4.08        | 4.13  | 4.38 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0   | 1    | 4    | 15 | 4.70 | 204/1405 | 4.70   | 4.03 | 4.12        | 4.24  | 4.70 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 5    | 16 | 4.76 | 182/1504 | 4.76   | 4.22 | 4.16        | 4.21  | 4.76 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 20 | 5.00 | 1/1519   | 5.00   | 4.86 | 4.70        | 4.77  | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6  | 3  | 0 | 0   | 1    | 5    | 6  | 4.42 | 470/1495 | 4.54   | 4.15 | 4.11        | 4.20  | 4.54 |
| Lecture   |    |    |   |     |      |      |    |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 1    | 20 | 4.95 | 100/1459 | 4.95   | 4.60 | 4.47        | 4.48  | 4.95 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 1    | 2    | 18 | 4.81 | 806/1460 | 4.88   | 4.79 | 4.74        | 4.77  | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 3    | 16 | 4.84 | 226/1455 | 4.86   | 4.32 | 4.32        | 4.31  | 4.86 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 1  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 4    | 16 | 4.80 | 315/1456 | 4.84   | 4.37 | 4.34        | 4.32  | 4.84 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1  | 1  | 0 | 1   | 0    | 4    | 14 | 4.63 | 215/1316 | 4.63   | 4.21 | 4.03        | 3.86  | 4.63 |
| Discussion  |    |    |   |     |      |      |    |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 6    | 13 | 4.68 | 284/1243 | 4.68   | 3.87 | 4.17        | 4.23  | 4.68 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 3    | 8    | 8  | 4.26 | 763/1241 | 4.26   | 4.25 | 4.33        | 4.39  | 4.26 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 5    | 14 | 4.74 | 429/1236 | 4.74   | 4.33 | 4.40        | 4.47  | 4.74 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 2  | 6  | 0 | 0   | 3    | 3    | 7  | 4.31 | 309/889  | 4.31   | 3.98 | 4.02        | 4.06  | 4.31 |

**Course-Section: BTEC 660 01** 

**Term - Fall 2011** 

**Enrollment: 31** 

\_\_\_\_

Title: Reg. Issues In Biotech

**Instructor:** Moreira, Antonio

|   |    |    |   | Fre | quen | cies |   | Ins  | structor | Course | Org  | <b>UMBC</b> | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Questions   | NR | NA | 1 | 2   | 3    | 4    | 5 | Mean | Rank     | Mean   | Mean | Mean        | Mean  | Mean |
| Laboratory  |    |    |   |     |      |      |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 19 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 1    | 1 | 4.50 | ****/165 | ****   | 4.58 | 4.19        | 3.75  | **** |
| Seminar   |    |    |   |     |      |      |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 15 | 2  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 4 | 5.00 | ****/67  | ****   | 4.33 | 4.60        | 4.62  | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 16 | 1  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 1    | 3 | 4.75 | ****/66  | ****   | 4.80 | 4.55        | 4.62  | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 17 | 2  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 2 | 5.00 | ****/62  | ****   | 4.60 | 4.54        | 4.59  | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 16 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 2    | 3 | 4.60 | ****/68  | ****   | **** | 4.59        | 4.62  | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 16 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 1    | 4 | 4.80 | ****/66  | ****   | 3.40 | 4.20        | 4.26  | **** |
| Field Work  |    |    |   |     |      |      |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 18 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 1    | 0    | 2 | 4.33 | ****/32  | ****   | **** | 4.36        | 4.44  | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 18 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 3 | 5.00 | ****/31  | ****   | **** | 4.15        | 4.39  | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 18 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 3 | 5.00 | ****/23  | ****   | 5.00 | 4.48        | 4.56  | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 19 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 2 | 5.00 | ****/27  | ****   | 4.60 | 4.23        | 4.32  | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 19 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 0    | 2 | 5.00 | ****/20  | ****   | **** | 4.23        | 4.52  | **** |
| Self Paced  |    |    |   |     |      |      |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 17 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 1    | 3 | 4.75 | ****/24  | ****   | 4.00 | 4.17        | 4.13  | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 17 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 1    | 3 | 4.75 | ****/15  | ****   | 4.20 | 4.17        | 4.48  | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 18 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 1    | 0    | 2 | 4.33 | ****/22  | ****   | 4.40 | 4.07        | 4.67  | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 19 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 1    | 1 | 4.50 | ****/15  | ****   | 3.80 | 4.06        | 4.90  | **** |

Course-Section: BTEC 660 01

Title: Reg. Issues In Biotech

Instructor: Moreira, Antonio

Term - Fall 2011

Enrollment: 31

Questionnaires: 21

|  |    |    |   | Fre | quen | cies |   | Ins  | structor | Course | Org  | <b>UMBC</b> | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|---|-----|------|------|---|------|----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Questions  | NR | NA | 1 | 2   | 3    | 4    | 5 | Mean | Rank     | Mean   | Mean | Mean        | Mean  | Mean |
| Self Paced   |    |    |   |     |      |      |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 19 | 0  | 0 | 0   | 0    | 1    | 1 | 4.50 | ****/12  | ****   | 4.40 | 4.16        | 4.68  | **** |

## **Frequency Distribution**

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GP   | 4 | Expected | l Grades | Reasons             |    | Туре             |             | Majors           |    |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|----|------------------|-------------|------------------|----|
| 00-27     | 3     | 0.00-0.99 | 4 | Α        | 13       | Required for Majors | 10 | Graduate         | 10          | Major            | 0  |
| 28-55     | 0     | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В        | 2        |                     |    |                  |             |                  |    |
| 56-83     | 0     | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | С        | 0        | General             | 0  | Under-grad       | 11          | Non-major        | 21 |
| 84-150    | 0     | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D        | 0        |                     |    |                  |             |                  |    |
| Grad.     | 10    | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F        | 0        | Electives           | 5  | **** - Means th  | ere are not | enough responses |    |
|           |       |           |   | Р        | 1        |                     |    | to be significan | t           |                  |    |
|           |       |           |   | I        | 0        | Other               | 1  |                  |             |                  |    |
|           |       |           |   | ?        | 5        |                     |    |                  |             |                  |    |

**Course-Section: BTEC 660 01** 

**Term - Fall 2011** 

**Enrollment: 31** 

Title: Reg. Issues In Biotech

**Instructor:** Federici, Mary M

|   | Frequencies |    |   |   |   | Instructor |    | Course | Org      | <b>UMBC</b> | Level | Sect |      |      |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|------------|----|--------|----------|-------------|-------|------|------|------|
| Questions   | 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 | 4          | 17 | 4.81   | 230/1520 | 4.81        | 4.48  | 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.81 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3          | 17 | 4.76   | 237/1520 | 4.76        | 4.31  | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.76 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4          | 13 | 4.50   | 546/1291 | 4.50        | 4.28  | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3          | 17 | 4.85   | 138/1483 | 4.85        | 4.15  | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.85 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5          | 12 | 4.38   | 492/1417 | 4.38        | 4.16  | 4.08 | 4.13 | 4.38 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4          | 15 | 4.70   | 204/1405 | 4.70        | 4.03  | 4.12 | 4.24 | 4.70 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5          | 16 | 4.76   | 182/1504 | 4.76        | 4.22  | 4.16 | 4.21 | 4.76 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0          | 20 | 5.00   | 1/1519   | 5.00        | 4.86  | 4.70 | 4.77 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4          | 8  | 4.67   | 217/1495 | 4.54        | 4.15  | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.54 |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |          |             |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 16 | 4.94   | 119/1459 | 4.95        | 4.60  | 4.47 | 4.48 | 4.95 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1          | 17 | 4.94   | 326/1460 | 4.88        | 4.79  | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.88 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 14 | 4.88   | 194/1455 | 4.86        | 4.32  | 4.32 | 4.31 | 4.86 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2          | 15 | 4.88   | 223/1456 | 4.84        | 4.37  | 4.34 | 4.32 | 4.84 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 4           | 1  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3          | 12 | 4.63   | 221/1316 | 4.63        | 4.21  | 4.03 | 3.86 | 4.63 |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |            |    |        |          |             |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6          | 13 | 4.68   | 284/1243 | 4.68        | 3.87  | 4.17 | 4.23 | 4.68 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8          | 8  | 4.26   | 763/1241 | 4.26        | 4.25  | 4.33 | 4.39 | 4.26 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5          | 14 | 4.74   | 429/1236 | 4.74        | 4.33  | 4.40 | 4.47 | 4.74 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 2           | 6  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3          | 7  | 4.31   | 309/889  | 4.31        | 3.98  | 4.02 | 4.06 | 4.31 |

**Course-Section: BTEC 660 01** 

**Term - Fall 2011** 

**Enrollment: 31** 

Title: Reg. Issues In Biotech

**Instructor: Federici, Mary M** 

|   |    |    | Frequencies |   |   | Instructor |   | Course | Org      | <b>UMBC</b> | Level | Sect |      |      |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|------------|---|--------|----------|-------------|-------|------|------|------|
| Questions   | NR | NA | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4          | 5 | Mean   | Rank     | Mean        | Mean  | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Laboratory  |    |    |             |   |   |            |   |        |          |             |       |      |      |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 19 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1          | 1 | 4.50   | ****/165 | ****        | 4.58  | 4.19 | 3.75 | **** |
| Seminar   |    |    |             |   |   |            |   |        |          |             |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 15 | 2  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0          | 4 | 5.00   | ****/67  | ****        | 4.33  | 4.60 | 4.62 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 16 | 1  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1          | 3 | 4.75   | ****/66  | ****        | 4.80  | 4.55 | 4.62 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 17 | 2  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0          | 2 | 5.00   | ****/62  | ****        | 4.60  | 4.54 | 4.59 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 16 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2          | 3 | 4.60   | ****/68  | ****        | ****  | 4.59 | 4.62 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 16 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1          | 4 | 4.80   | ****/66  | ****        | 3.40  | 4.20 | 4.26 | **** |
| Field Work  |    |    |             |   |   |            |   |        |          |             |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 18 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0          | 2 | 4.33   | ****/32  | ****        | ****  | 4.36 | 4.44 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 18 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0          | 3 | 5.00   | ****/31  | ****        | ****  | 4.15 | 4.39 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 18 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0          | 3 | 5.00   | ****/23  | ****        | 5.00  | 4.48 | 4.56 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 19 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0          | 2 | 5.00   | ****/27  | ****        | 4.60  | 4.23 | 4.32 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 19 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0          | 2 | 5.00   | ****/20  | ****        | ****  | 4.23 | 4.52 | **** |
| Self Paced  |    |    |             |   |   |            |   |        |          |             |       |      |      |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 17 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1          | 3 | 4.75   | ****/24  | ****        | 4.00  | 4.17 | 4.13 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 17 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1          | 3 | 4.75   | ****/15  | ****        | 4.20  | 4.17 | 4.48 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 18 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0          | 2 | 4.33   | ****/22  | ****        | 4.40  | 4.07 | 4.67 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 19 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1          | 1 | 4.50   | ****/15  | ****        | 3.80  | 4.06 | 4.90 | **** |

Course-Section: BTEC 660 01

Title: Reg. Issues In Biotech

Instructor: Federici, Mary M

**Term - Fall 2011** 

Enrollment: 31

**Questionnaires: 21** 

|  |    |    | Frequencies |   |   |   |   | Ins  | structor | Course | Org  | <b>UMBC</b> | Level | Sect |
|--|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------|----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|------|
| Questions  | NR | NA | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank     | Mean   | Mean | Mean        | Mean  | Mean |
| Self Paced   |    |    |             |   |   |   |   |      |          |        |      |             |       |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 19 | 0  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/12  | ****   | 4.40 | 4.16        | 4.68  | **** |

## **Frequency Distribution**

| Credits E | <b>Credits Earned</b> |           | d Cum. GPA |   | l Grades | Reasons             |    | Туре             |             | Majors           |    |  |
|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|------------|---|----------|---------------------|----|------------------|-------------|------------------|----|--|
| 00-27     | 3                     | 0.00-0.99 | 4          | Α | 13       | Required for Majors | 10 | Graduate         | 10          | Major            | 0  |  |
| 28-55     | 0                     | 1.00-1.99 | 0          | В | 2        |                     |    |                  |             |                  |    |  |
| 56-83     | 0                     | 2.00-2.99 | 0          | С | 0        | General             | 0  | Under-grad       | 11          | Non-major        | 21 |  |
| 84-150    | 0                     | 3.00-3.49 | 1          | D | 0        |                     |    |                  |             |                  |    |  |
| Grad.     | 10                    | 3.50-4.00 | 2          | F | 0        | Electives           | 5  | **** - Means th  | ere are not | enough responses |    |  |
|           |                       |           |            | Р | 1        |                     |    | to be significan | t           |                  |    |  |
|           |                       |           |            | I | 0        | Other               | 1  |                  |             |                  |    |  |
|           |                       |           |            | ? | 5        |                     |    |                  |             |                  |    |  |