

Course-Section: BTEC 651 8010
 Title MOLEC. AND CELL BIOLOG
 Instructor: WAGNER, CYNTHIA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 224
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	1112/1576	4.07	4.51	4.30	4.43	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	759/1576	4.40	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	552/1342	4.53	4.50	4.32	4.38	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	10	4.40	513/1465	4.40	4.27	4.12	4.25	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	966/1434	3.93	4.42	4.14	4.35	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	259/1547	4.73	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1056/1574	4.53	4.78	4.64	4.75	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	2	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.24	4.10	4.18	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	1181/1488	4.14	4.55	4.47	4.52	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	849/1493	4.79	4.90	4.73	4.80	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.54	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	1	8	4.07	1080/1489	4.07	4.49	4.32	4.38	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	569/1277	4.21	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	1	9	4.27	657/1279	4.27	4.66	4.17	4.34	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.81	4.35	4.55	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	245/ 878	4.47	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 234	****	4.47	4.23	4.36	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.81	4.35	4.37	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.69	4.29	4.47	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.33	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.39	4.01	4.10	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.76	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.88	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/ 326	4.75	4.96	4.03	4.10	4.75	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.67	4.60	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.33	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	174/ 382	4.75	4.95	4.08	4.13	4.75	

Course-Section: BTEC 651 8010
 Title MOLEC. AND CELL BIOLOG
 Instructor: WAGNER, CYNTHIA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 224
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: BTEC 654 8010
 Title TOPICS IN BIOTECHNOLOG
 Instructor: BROEDEL, SHELDON
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 225
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	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	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	568/1576	4.56	4.51	4.30	4.43	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1067/1576	4.11	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1097/1342	3.83	4.50	4.32	4.38	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	453/1520	4.56	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1130/1465	3.71	4.27	4.12	4.25	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.42	4.14	4.35	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	1	3	1	3.25	1413/1547	3.25	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	720/1574	4.78	4.78	4.64	4.75	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.24	4.10	4.18	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	1321/1488	3.89	4.55	4.47	4.52	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.89	4.90	4.73	4.80	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	981/1486	4.22	4.54	4.32	4.37	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1283/1489	3.67	4.49	4.32	4.38	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	818/1277	3.88	4.26	4.03	4.08	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	413/1279	4.56	4.66	4.17	4.34	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	597/1270	4.56	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	614/1269	4.56	4.81	4.35	4.55	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	4.28	4.05	4.11	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	3.33	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	4.39	4.01	4.10	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.96	4.03	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 9
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: BTEC 680 8010
 Title FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT
 Instructor: PETERSON, SANDR
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 226
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	0	4	21	4.69	373/1576	4.69	4.51	4.30	4.43	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	0	25	4.92	121/1576	4.92	4.33	4.27	4.32	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	215/1342	4.84	4.50	4.32	4.38	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	197/1520	4.80	4.35	4.25	4.36	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.27	4.12	4.25	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	5	19	4.68	261/1434	4.68	4.42	4.14	4.35	4.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	98/1547	4.92	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	339/1554	4.58	4.24	4.10	4.18	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	339/1488	4.85	4.55	4.47	4.52	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	223/1493	4.96	4.90	4.73	4.80	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	137/1486	4.92	4.54	4.32	4.37	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	217/1489	4.88	4.49	4.32	4.38	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	4	6	15	4.31	489/1277	4.31	4.26	4.03	4.08	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	305/1279	4.71	4.66	4.17	4.34	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	310/1269	4.88	4.81	4.35	4.55	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	1	1	5	15	4.39	288/ 878	4.39	4.28	4.05	4.11	4.39	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.81	4.35	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.33	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.39	4.01	4.10	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.76	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.88	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.96	4.03	4.10	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.67	4.60	4.50	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.95	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 10
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	16
?	0		