```
Course-Section: MAED 505S 2301                University of Maryland                          Page 1030
Title                                          Baltimore County                              FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    STALEY, JOHN                      Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires: 11                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequencies        Instructor    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    1   0   0   0   3   3   4  4.10 1068/1639  4.55  4.51  4.27  4.42  4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   0   0   2   6   2  4.00 1090/1639  4.50  4.32  4.22  4.26  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   2   5   3  4.10  935/1397  4.55  4.58  4.28  4.37  4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   1   0   1   1   4   3  4.00 1010/1583  4.45  4.46  4.19  4.31  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   1   2   4   1   1   1  2.44 1506/1532  3.39  4.00  4.01  4.10  2.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0   0   1   2   6   1  3.70 1092/1504  4.15  4.37  4.05  4.29  3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   0   2   2   6  4.40  632/1612  4.70  4.36  4.16  4.27  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   3   7  4.70  968/1635  4.75  4.78  4.65  4.81  4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0   0   0   4   3   1  3.63 1257/1579  4.21  4.24  4.08  4.17  3.63

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   1   6   4  4.27 1077/1518  4.64  4.51  4.43  4.49  4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0   0   0   0   3   7  4.70  992/1520  4.85  4.85  4.70  4.79  4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   0   2   3   4   0  3.22 1429/1517  4.11  4.41  4.27  4.32  3.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0   0   0   3   6   1  3.80 1215/1550  4.40  4.34  4.22  4.23  3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  4   0   2   1   2   1  3.33 1067/1295  3.31  3.89  3.94  3.95  3.33

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0   0   0   2   7   1  3.90  887/1398  4.45  4.48  4.07  4.22  3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0   0   0   1   4   5  4.40  694/1391  4.70  4.64  4.30  4.47  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0   0   0   0   3   7  4.70  459/1388  4.85  4.61  4.28  4.49  4.70
4. Were special techniques successful                   1   5   2   0   1   2   0  2.60  907/ 958  3.66  4.27  3.93  4.01  2.60
```

                            Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                  Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     4        0.00-0.99   0        A    5        Required for Majors   0      Graduate      6       Major        0
 28-55     0        1.00-1.99   0        B    6
 56-83     0        2.00-2.99   0        C    0        General               0      Under-grad    5       Non-major   11
 84-150    0        3.00-3.49   0        D    0
 Grad.     6        3.50-4.00   4        F    0        Electives             0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                10
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MAED 505S 2302                    University of Maryland                                  Page 1031
Title                                              Baltimore County                                       FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    BARNES, WILLIAM                     Fall   2007                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     13
Questionnaires: 11                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                      Frequencies        Instructor    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   0  11  5.00    1/1639   4.55  4.51   4.27 4.42  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00    1/1639   4.50  4.32   4.22 4.26  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the 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 other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1  10  4.91  143/1583   4.45  4.46   4.19 4.31  4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute to 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 the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   0   0  11  5.00    1/1612   4.70  4.36   4.16 4.27  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   0   0   0   2   8  4.80  811/1635   4.75  4.78   4.65 4.81  4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  0   0   0   0   2   8  4.80  137/1579   4.21  4.24   4.08 4.17  4.80

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   0   0   0   9  5.00    1/1518   4.64  4.51   4.43 4.49  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   0   9  5.00    1/1520   4.85  4.85   4.70 4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and 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 the lectures contribute to 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 audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  3   2   0   1   2   2  3.29 1089/1295   3.31  3.89   3.94 3.95  3.29

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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 all students actively encouraged 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 the instructor encourage fair and 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 special techniques successful                  2   2   0   0   0   2   5  4.71  135/ 958   3.66  4.27   3.93 4.01  4.71
```

```
                                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      2       0.00-0.99    0       A   10        Required for Majors   0     Graduate       4      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   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 not enough
                                          P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                10
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MAED 521  8720              University of Maryland                         Page 1032
Title      MATHEMATICAL REASONING            Baltimore County                            FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    FRICK, JERRI                  Fall   2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      27
Questionnaires:  26                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies        Instructor   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  8 18  4.69  391/1639  4.69  4.51  4.27 4.42  4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1 10 15  4.54  486/1639  4.54  4.32  4.22 4.26  4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  23  0  0  0  0  3  5.00  ****/1397  ****  4.58  4.28 4.37  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  5 19  4.65  331/1583  4.65  4.46  4.19 4.31  4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  1 12 11  4.42  430/1532  4.42  4.00  4.01 4.10  4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 12 12  4.44  441/1504  4.44  4.37  4.05 4.29  4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  1  4 20  4.76  207/1612  4.76  4.36  4.16 4.27  4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  0 24  5.00    1/1635  5.00  4.78  4.65 4.81  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 14 8  4.36  538/1579  4.36  4.24  4.08 4.17  4.36


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  3  9 14  4.42  919/1518  4.42  4.51  4.43 4.49  4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1 25  4.96  219/1520  4.96  4.85  4.70 4.79  4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  9 16  4.64  428/1517  4.64  4.41  4.27 4.32  4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  2  6 18  4.62  511/1550  4.62  4.34  4.22 4.23  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 6 0 1 8 6 5  3.75  838/1295  3.75  3.89  3.94 3.95  3.75


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 9 17  4.65  336/1398  4.65  4.48  4.07 4.22  4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 3 22  4.81  332/1391  4.81  4.64  4.30 4.47  4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 4 22  4.85  286/1388  4.85  4.61  4.28 4.49  4.85
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   0  0  0  8  8 10  4.08  442/ 958  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  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 24 0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  ****/  82  ****  4.53  4.52 4.74  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 24 0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  ****/  78  ****  4.34  4.47 4.52  ****
4. Did presentations 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 experience contribute to what you learned 25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  52  ****  4.60  4.04 3.64  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  53  ****  4.31  4.05 4.03  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        25  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  42  ****  4.72  4.75 4.78  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    25  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  37  ****  4.42  4.58 4.33  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons             Type                Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      1      0.00-0.99    3      A    26      Required for Majors  0    Graduate     23    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    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
                                      P     0                               responses to be significant
                                      I     0      Other               25
                                      ?     0
```

```
Course-Section:  MAED 527 8720              University of Maryland                                    Page   14
Title            Cult Resp Inst in Math      Baltimore County                                          FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:      Wray, J.      (Instr. A)         Fall   2007                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:        0
Questionnaires:  26                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                         Frequencies        Instructor    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 6 0  0   0   1   5  14  4.65   248/1579  ****  4.13  4.08  3.95  4.63

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   0  26  5.00     1/1518  ****  4.46  4.43  4.38  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   0  24  5.00     1/1520  ****  4.76  4.70  4.61  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   0   3  22  4.88   173/1517  ****  4.43  4.27  4.20  4.84
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0   0   0   4  20  4.83   253/1550  ****  4.20  4.22  4.17  4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0   1   1   3  20  4.68   179/1295  ****  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

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     9        0.00-0.99    5        A   21       Required for Majors   0      Graduate    12      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  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
                                           P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                           I    0       Other                21
                                           ?    0
```

Questionnaires: 26                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

```
                                             Frequencies      Instructor   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
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type               Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     9      0.00-0.99   5      A   21      Required for Majors  0     Graduate     12     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   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
                                    P    0                                responses to be significant
                                    I    0      Other               21
                                    ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MAED 551 8720           University of Maryland                              Page   16
Title       Inquiry I Ptrns Func Alg     Baltimore County                                  FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:    Floyd, R.                  Fall  2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      0
Questionnaires: 24                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                        Frequencies      Instructor   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    1   0   0   1   4  10   8  4.09 1082/1639  ****  4.31  4.27  4.08  4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0   1   3   6  10   3  3.48 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  ****  4.51  4.28  4.18  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     2   2   1   5   4   5   5  3.40 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  3.22 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  3.26 1337/1504  ****  4.14  4.05  3.78  3.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             2   0   2   7   3   3   7  3.27 1469/1612  ****  4.13  4.16  4.10  3.27
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   0   0   9  14  4.61 1067/1635  ****  4.78  4.65  4.56  4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7  0   1   1   6   7   2  3.47 1331/1579  ****  4.13  4.08  3.95  3.47

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0   1   2   7   8   5  3.61 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  4.52 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  3.52 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  3.61 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  2.00 ****/ 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  3.40 ****/  78  ****  4.71  4.47  4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    19   0   1   0   3   1   0  2.80 ****/  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  2.00 ****/  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  ****
```

Enrollment:        0
Questionnaires:  24                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned              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        B     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
                                              P     0                                       responses to be significant
                                              I     0         Other                 7
                                              ?     0