

Course-Section: SCIE 503 8720
 Title LIFE SCI CONCEPTS/PRIN
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1353
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	0	0	2	0	1	3	12	4.28	864/1504	4.28	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	437/1503	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.28	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	766/1290	4.28	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	385/1453	4.56	4.22	4.21	4.34	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	241/1421	4.61	4.08	4.00	4.27	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	199/1365	4.65	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	2	4	10	4.11	926/1485	4.11	4.20	4.16	4.24	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	710/1483	4.18	4.07	4.06	4.20	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	107/1425	4.94	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	475/1418	4.59	4.29	4.25	4.36	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	472/1416	4.65	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	189/1199	4.65	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	5	10	4.35	512/1312	4.35	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	770/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	774/1299	4.29	4.34	4.25	4.56	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	146/ 758	4.63	4.05	4.01	4.24	4.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	47/ 233	4.67	4.07	4.09	4.56	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	41/ 244	4.73	4.12	4.09	4.09	4.73
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	48/ 227	4.87	4.49	4.40	4.66	4.87
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	72/ 225	4.71	4.40	4.23	4.69	4.71
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	46/ 207	4.67	4.22	4.09	4.40	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	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	14	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P 0
I 0
? 0

Other

14

responses to be significant