

Course-Section: MAED 506S 2301  
 Title  
 Instructor: STALEY, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1016  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	467/1615	4.58	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1200/1566	3.67	4.14	4.07	4.20	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	560/1528	4.40	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	457/1650	4.58	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	525/1549	4.64	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	333/1546	4.82	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	254/1323	4.64	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	409/1384	4.55	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	337/1378	4.82	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	386/1378	4.80	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	605/ 904	3.80	4.34	4.03	4.04	3.80

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 6	Major 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 6	Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 12		
				? 1			

Course-Section: MAED 531 8720  
 Title NUMBER NUM SYST & OPER  
 Instructor: MARSH, LAUREL  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1017  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	427/1670	4.71	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	465/1666	4.63	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	14	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	369/1566	4.54	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	9	11	4.21	751/1528	4.21	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	10	11	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	338/1667	4.96	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	595/1626	4.38	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	596/1560	4.91	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	352/1549	4.76	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	495/1546	4.68	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	242/1323	4.65	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	510/1378	4.63	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 7 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 17 Non-major 24
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MAED 552 8720  
 Title INQUII PROB DATA ANAL&S  
 Instructor: STALEY, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1018  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 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	1	0	0	2	0	4	12	4.44	751/1670	4.44	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	556/1666	4.56	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	576/1406	4.53	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	9	4.16	981/1615	4.16	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	9	3.89	1019/1566	3.89	4.14	4.07	4.20	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	600/1528	4.37	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	769/1650	4.37	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.37
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	946/1667	4.74	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	467/1626	4.47	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	755/1546	4.47	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	3	4	2	6	3.73	926/1323	3.73	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	348/1384	4.63	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	466/1378	4.68	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	384/ 904	4.23	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.23
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	3	1	1	4	4	3.38	210/ 232	3.38	3.38	4.19	4.30	3.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	2	0	7	3	2	3.21	225/ 239	3.21	3.21	4.21	4.53	3.21
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	2	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	203/ 230	3.82	3.82	4.44	4.69	3.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	3	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	155/ 231	4.10	4.10	4.31	4.58	4.10
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	1	0	1	4	3	4	3.83	174/ 218	3.83	3.83	4.18	4.47	3.83
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	2	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	72/ 87	4.14	4.68	4.65	4.61	4.14
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	43/ 79	4.88	4.43	4.64	4.67	4.88
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	47/ 75	4.57	4.61	4.57	4.66	4.57
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	43/ 79	4.56	4.47	4.45	4.58	4.56
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	27/ 80	4.56	4.40	3.97	4.32	4.56
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	33/ 41	4.20	4.76	4.50	4.65	4.20
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	26/ 28	3.57	3.57	4.64	4.82	3.57
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	12/ 16	4.17	4.17	4.67	4.60	4.17
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	17/ 27	4.67	4.67	4.54	4.67	4.67
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	9/ 10	4.40	4.40	4.84	4.90	4.40
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****

Course-Section: MAED 552 8720  
 Title INQII PROB DATA ANAL&S  
 Instructor: STALEY, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 1018  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	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	9	Non-major	19
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						