Course-Section: MAED 505S 2301 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

Instructor: STALEY, JOHN Fall 2007

Grad.

6

3.50-4.00

Enrollment:	13				
Questionnaires:	11	Student Cou	rse Eva	aluation	Questionnaire

Ρ

I

?

0

0

					2				Instructor		Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did	vou gai	n new insights,ski		om this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4 10	1068/1639	4.55	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.10
		tructor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	6	2		1090/1639	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.00
		m questions reflec			1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	,	4.55	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.10
		valuations reflect		_	1	1	0	1	1	4	3		1010/1583	4.45	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.00
		d readings contrib		1 3	1	1	2	4	1	1	1		1506/1532		4.00	4.01	4.10	2.44
	_	_		to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	1		1092/1504		4.37	4.05	4.29	3.70
		ding system clearl		-	1	0	0	0	2	2	6				4.36	4.16	4.27	4.40
	_	mes was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70			4.78	4.65	4.81	4.70
	-			ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	3	1		1257/1579		4.24	4.08	4.17	
_		Lectur	_						_									
		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	4		1077/1518		4.51	4.43	4.49	4.27		
		tructor seem inter		_	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	992/1520	4.85	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.70
		material presente			2	0	0	2	3	4	0		1429/1517	4.11	4.41	4.27	4.32	3.22
		tures contribute t		•	1	0	0	0	3	6	1		1215/1550		4.34	4.22	4.23	3.80
5. Did	audiovi	sual techniques en	hance ;	your understanding	1	4	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1067/1295	3.31	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class d	iscussions contrib		what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	887/1398	4.45	4.48	4.07	4.22	3.90
		udents actively en		-	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	694/1391	4.70	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.40
		_	_	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	459/1388		4.61	4.28	4.49	4.70
		l techniques succe			1	5	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	907/ 958		4.27	3.93	4.01	
		Frequ	lency	7 Dist	rib	ution	ı											
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	des Reasons				Ту	pe			Majors	1				
00-27		0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	е	6	Majo	r	0
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	В 6		a		,				0	TT		-	37		11
56-83		2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera.	Т				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	11
84-15	0 0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														

Electives

10

Other

Page 1030

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: MAED 505S 2302 University of Maryland Title Barnes, WILLIAM Fall 2007

I

?

0

0

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 11

13

University of Maryland Page 1031
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	COULSE	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					Frequencies				Inst			Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1639	4.55	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1639	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.26	5.00
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1397	4.55	4.58	4.28	4.37	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	143/1583	4.45	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.91
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	506/1532	3.39	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.33
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	291/1504	4.15	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.60
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1612	4.70	4.36	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1635	4.75	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.80
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	137/1579	4.21	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.80
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instr	prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1518	4.64	4.51	4.43	4.49	5.00		
2. Did th	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	4.85	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	4.11	4.41	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1550	4.40	4.34	4.22	4.23	5.00
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	3	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1089/1295	3.31	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.29
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1398	4.45	4.48	4.07	4.22	5.00
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1391	4.70	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1388	4.85	4.61	4.28	4.49	5.00
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		2	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	135/ 958	3.66	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.71
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	asons	3			Ту	ne			Majors	ı.
										- 								
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	4	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1				_				_	_	_	_			
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ger	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	11
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0												_						
Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 8 F 0					Electives 0 #### - Means there are no						_	ŗh						
P 0										responses				es to be significant				

Other

10

Course-Section: MAED 521 8720

Title MATHEMATICAL REASONING

Instructor: FRICK, JERRI

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1032 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
	General																
1. Did vou gain r	new insights, skills from	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	4.69	391/16	39	4.69	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.69
	actor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	1	10	15	4.54	486/16		4.54	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.54
	questions reflect the e		0	23	0	0	0	0	3				****	4.58	4.28	4.37	****
	luations reflect the ex	_	0	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	331/15		4.65	4.46	4.19		4.65
	readings contribute to		2	0	0	0	1	12	11	4.42	430/15		4.42	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.42
	ssignments contribute t		1	0	0	0	1	12	12		441/15		4.44	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.44
	ng system clearly expla	_	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76			4.76	4.36	4.16		4.76
_	was class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/16		5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00
_	grade the overall teac	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	14					4.36		4.08	4.17	
	Lecture																
1. Were the instr	ructor's lectures well	orepared	0	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	919/15	18	4.42	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.42
	actor seem interested is		0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	219/15	20	4.96	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.96
	aterial presented and e	_	1	0	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	428/15	17	4.64	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.64
	res contribute to what		0	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	511/15	550	4.62		4.22	4.23	4.62
5. Did audiovisua	al techniques enhance y	our understanding	0	6	0	1	8	6				95	3.75	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.75
	Discussion																
1. Did class disc	cussions contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	9	17	4.65	336/13	98	4.65	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.65
2. Were all stude	ents actively encourage	d to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	332/13	91	4.81	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.81
	actor encourage fair and		0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	286/13	888	4.85	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.85
4. Were special t	cechniques successful	_	0	0	0	0	8	8	10	4.08	442/ 9	58	4.08	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.08
	Seminar																
1. Were assigned	topics relevant to the	announced theme	22	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	85	****	4.39	4.58	4.58	***
Was the instru	actor available for ind	ividual attention	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/	82	****	4.53	4.52	4.74	***
Did research p	projects contribute to	what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/	78	****	4.34	4.47	4.52	***
4. Did presentati	ions contribute to what	you learned	24	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/	80	****	4.25	4.47	4.50	***
5. Were criteria	for grading made clear		24	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	82	****	4.35	4.16	4.37	****
	Field Work																
1. Did field expe	erience contribute to w	nat you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	52	****	4.60	4.04	3.64	****
Did you clear!	ly understand your eval	uation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	53	****	4.31	4.05	4.03	****
3. Was the instru	actor available for con	sultation	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	42	****	4.72	4.75	4.78	****
4. To what degree	e could you discuss you	r evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	37	****	4.42	4.58	4.33	***
	Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	utio	n											
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s				Тур	oe .			Majors	;
 00-27 1	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 3 A 26						or Ma			0	 Gradu			 :3	Majo		0
28-55 0	B 0		rec	4urre	eu I	J⊥ 1 ^v 1e	a joi	o	U	Gradu	ialt	5 Z		ria JC	, 1	U	
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0					General				0 Under-		-gr	rad	3	Non-	major	26	
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 23 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					Electives					1 #### - Means there are not enough		rh					
grad. 25 5.50-4.00 0 r 0										_		onses to be signi			_	•	
		- A		0 - 1					0	_							

Other

25

I 0

Course-Section: MAED 527 8720 University of Maryland Title

I

?

0

0

Baltimore County Cult Resp Inst in Math Instructor: Wray, J. (Instr. A) Fall 2007

Page 14

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

	<u> </u>	•	,
Enrollment:	0		
Questionnaires:	26		Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					- 1					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	222/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	4.85
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	142/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.88
		uestions reflec			0	18	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1397	***	4.51	4.28	4.18	5.00
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	4.69	299/1583	***	4.31	4.19	4.01	4.69
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	8	15	4.54	311/1532	***	4.07	4.01	3.88	4.54
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	215/1504	****	4.14	4.05	3.78	4.71
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	270/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	4.71
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	248/1579	****	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.63
		T																
1 Wassa 4	-6	Lectur		0	0	0	0	0	0	20	г оо	1/1510	****	4.46	4 42	4.38	г оо	
		uctor's lecture		0	0	0	0	0	0	26 24	5.00	1/1518 1/1520	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	5.00 5.00	
	 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 							0	0	0	22	4.88	173/1517		4.76	4.70	4.01	4.84
		teriai presente es contribute t			1 2	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.88	253/1550		4.43	4.27	4.20	4.84
				you rearned your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	3	20	4.68	179/1295		4.20	3.94	3.84	4.65
5. DIG at	udiovisua.	ı techniques en	nance y	our understanding	Т	U	U	Т	Τ	3	20	4.68	1/9/1295		4.31	3.94	3.84	4.05
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	65/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	4.96
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	181/1391	****	4.60	4.30	4.07	4.92
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	90/1388	****	4.53	4.28	4.01	4.96
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	67/ 958	****	4.39	3.93	3.71	4.92
				Frequ	ona	. Dia	+ r i h	t i o	n									
				riequ	lency	DIS	CIID	ucio.	11									
Credits E	Earned	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3		
00-27	-27 9 0.00-0.99 5 A 21						auir	ed f	or Ma		s	0	Graduat	 e 1	.2	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		1000	-1 CTT.	ca I	O1 140	- J U L	~	ū	or adda c		-	1100	-	J
56-83						Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	26
84-150						General				7201 J144 11 HOII 1			3	-				
Grad.	Grad. 12 3.50-4.00 0 F 0						Electives 1 #### - Means				Means t	here a	re not	enouc	_j h			
	P 0												respons				_	
	P U										_		-					

Other

21

Course-Section: MAED 527 8720 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County Cult Resp Inst in Math

Ruehl, S. (Instr. B) Instructor: Enrollment: 0

Questionnaires: 26

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 15

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

		-			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	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	0	4	22	4.85	222/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	142/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	4.69	299/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	8	15	4.54	311/1532	****	4.07	4.01	3.88	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	215/1504	****	4.14	4.05	3.78	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	270/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	276/1579	****	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1518	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1520	****	4.76	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	239/1517	****	4.43	4.27	4.20	4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	174/1550	****	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	215/1295	****	4.31	3.94	3.84	4.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	65/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	4.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	181/1391	****	4.60	4.30	4.07	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	90/1388	****	4.53	4.28	4.01	4.96
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	67/ 958	****	4.39	3.93	3.71	4.92
Freq	uency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	;

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	5	 А	21	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	12	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MAED 551 8720

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Inquiry I Ptrns Func Alg

Instructor: Floyd, R.

Enrollment: 0 Questionnaires: 24

Title

Fall 2007

Page 16 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	NR	NΣ	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level	Sect Mean
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	10	8		1082/1639	****		4.27	4.08	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	6	10	3		1493/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	3.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	447/1397	****		4.28	4.18	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	5	4	5	5		1449/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	4	9	3		1374/1532	****	4.07	4.01	3.88	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	4	7	5		1337/1504	***	4.14	4.05	3.78	3.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	7 0	3 0	3 9	7		1469/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1 7	0	1	1	6	9 7			1067/1635	****		4.65	4.56	4.61 3.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	/	U	Т	Т	О	,	2	3.4/	1331/1579		4.13	4.08	3.95	3.4/
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	7	8	5		1404/1518	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	3.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	5	15		1173/1520	****	4.76	4.70	4.61	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	5	5	5	7		1339/1517	****	4.43	4.27	4.20	3.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	4	4	9		1297/1550	****	4.20	4.22	4.17	3.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	4	4	2	4	5	3.11	1149/1295	****	4.31	3.94	3.84	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	7	7	7	3.78	943/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	4	6	11	4.13	911/1391	****	4.60	4.30	4.07	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	674/1388	****	4.53	4.28	4.01	4.48
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	2	4	11	5	3.74	623/ 958	****	4.39	3.93	3.71	3.74
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	8	1	2	0	1	0	2.25	****/ 224	****	2.92	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	2	4	1	0	2.86	227/ 240	****	2.70	4.11	4.01	2.86
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	5	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	4.80	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	5	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 85	****	4.74	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	1	4	0	0	2.80	****/ 82		4.15	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	1	2	1	1		****/ 78	****	4.71	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	3	1	0		****/ 80	****	4.72	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	79/ 82	****	4.14	4.16	3.90	2.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	32/ 52	****	3.07	4.04	3.61	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/ 53	****	3.00	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	2	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 42	****	4.67	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	2	1	1	1	0	0		****/ 37		5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.56	4.60	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	49/ 50	****	4.07	4.45	4.54	2.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	2	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	2	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	****/ 43		4.20	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	3	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 32		4.33	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	3	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: MAED 551 8720

Inquiry I Ptrns Func Alg

Title Floyd, R.

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 16 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						