

Course-Section: MAED 504 8720  
 Title STAT/DATA ANALY/PROB  
 Instructor: CLARKIN, JENNIF  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1014  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	5	4	4	3.28	1502/1576	3.28	4.42	4.30	4.43	3.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	4	6	3.67	1345/1576	3.67	4.37	4.27	4.32	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	955/1342	4.06	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	7	4	3.56	1346/1520	3.56	4.46	4.25	4.36	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	7	2	6	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	4.29	4.12	4.25	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	3	6	3	3.17	1339/1434	3.17	4.37	4.14	4.35	3.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	399/1547	4.61	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	606/1574	4.83	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	4	6	1	3.38	1355/1554	3.38	4.08	4.10	4.18	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	1010/1488	4.39	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	868/1493	4.78	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	2	9	2	2	2.89	1445/1486	2.89	4.43	4.32	4.37	2.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	3	3	6	3.39	1350/1489	3.39	4.39	4.32	4.38	3.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	1	1	9	4	3.56	997/1277	3.56	4.10	4.03	4.08	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	3	5	6	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.53	4.17	4.34	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	6	4	5	3.56	1125/1270	3.56	4.69	4.35	4.53	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	4	5	0	8	3.56	1101/1269	3.56	4.73	4.35	4.55	3.56
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	5	3	3	2	3	2.69	842/ 878	2.69	4.36	4.05	4.11	2.69

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 14
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 4
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: MAED 505 8020  
 Title ADVANCED ALGEBRA/TRIG  
 Instructor: WARD, DEBRA  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1015  
 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	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.94	4.37	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	4.97	4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.94	4.46	4.25	4.36	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.81	4.37	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.97	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	4.88	4.08	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.97	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	4.97	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	4.91	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.94	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.66	4.10	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	4.79	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	4.88	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	4.97	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	4.71	4.36	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.58	4.03	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MAED 505 8720  
 Title ADVANCED ALGEBRA/TRIG  
 Instructor: WARD, DEBRA  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1016  
 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	0	0	17	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	166/1576	4.94	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	107/1342	4.97	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	149/1520	4.94	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	305/1434	4.81	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	74/1547	4.97	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	187/1554	4.88	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	149/1488	4.97	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1493	4.97	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	251/1486	4.91	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	217/1489	4.94	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	480/1277	4.66	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	393/1279	4.79	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	401/1270	4.88	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	167/1269	4.97	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	276/ 878	4.71	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.41	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 234	****	3.08	4.23	4.36	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	122/ 240	4.40	3.47	4.35	4.37	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.41	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.46	4.64	4.70	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.76	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.25	4.60	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.08	4.67	4.33	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.13	****	

Course-Section: MAED 505 8720  
 Title ADVANCED ALGEBRA/TRIG  
 Instructor: WARD, DEBRA  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1016  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MAED 531 8720  
 Title NUMBER NUM SYST & OPER  
 Instructor: GREIF, AMY G  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1017  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	13	4	1	1	2.17	1572/1576	2.17	4.42	4.30	4.43	2.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	8	7	6	1	2	2.25	1574/1576	2.25	4.37	4.27	4.32	2.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	4	3	8	2	2	2.74	1501/1520	2.74	4.46	4.25	4.36	2.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	12	6	4	1	0	1.74	1464/1465	1.74	4.29	4.12	4.25	1.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	6	8	4	3	1	2.32	1428/1434	2.32	4.37	4.14	4.35	2.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	5	8	6	3.54	1329/1547	3.54	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	18	5	4.17	1386/1574	4.17	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	4	3	11	0	1	2.53	1523/1554	2.53	4.08	4.10	4.18	2.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	8	8	3	3	2.88	1463/1488	2.88	4.58	4.47	4.52	2.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	3	7	10	3.92	1438/1493	3.92	4.80	4.73	4.80	3.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	5	11	2	2	2.71	1458/1486	2.71	4.43	4.32	4.37	2.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	12	3	7	1	1	2.00	1480/1489	2.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	8	4	5	0	3	2.30	1254/1277	2.30	4.10	4.03	4.08	2.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	6	8	3	4	2.96	1201/1279	2.96	4.53	4.17	4.34	2.96	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	5	5	8	4	3.29	1176/1270	3.29	4.69	4.35	4.53	3.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	1	6	4	11	3.88	999/1269	3.88	4.73	4.35	4.55	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	9	2	4	3	4	2.59	847/ 878	2.59	4.36	4.05	4.11	2.59	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	3.47	4.35	4.37	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	****/ 85	****	4.41	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 72	****	4.46	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 80	****	4.31	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 375	****	4.22	4.01	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.76	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.39	4.57	4.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	4.25	4.60	4.50	****	

Course-Section: MAED 531 8720  
 Title NUMBER NUM SYST & OPER  
 Instructor: GREIF, AMY G  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1017  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	13	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						