

Course-Section: MAED 502 8720  
 Title GEOMETRY & SPATIAL REA  
 Instructor: HANNA, DELLA  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 976  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	3	6	9	7	3.80	1244/1504	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.44	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	8	11	3	3.52	1297/1503	3.52	4.22	4.20	4.28	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	10	7	3.84	1046/1290	3.84	4.32	4.28	4.36	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	11	5	3.60	1253/1453	3.60	4.22	4.21	4.34	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	6	0	7	6	3	3.00	1305/1421	3.00	4.08	4.00	4.27	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	9	6	3	3.04	1291/1365	3.04	4.11	4.08	4.35	3.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	3	8	9	3.76	1170/1485	3.76	4.20	4.16	4.24	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	10	9	0	3.40	1276/1483	3.40	4.07	4.06	4.20	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	6	12	4.08	1136/1425	4.08	4.41	4.41	4.51	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	549/1426	4.88	4.72	4.69	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	6	8	6	3.56	1235/1418	3.56	4.29	4.25	4.36	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	8	9	3.92	1085/1416	3.92	4.34	4.26	4.38	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	3	6	5	8	3.70	848/1199	3.70	3.95	3.97	4.04	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	6	8	7	3.68	937/1312	3.68	4.12	4.00	4.31	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	3	3	6	13	4.16	851/1303	4.16	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.16
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	1	6	7	8	3.64	1082/1299	3.64	4.34	4.25	4.56	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	2	2	4	7	3	3.39	618/ 758	3.39	4.05	4.01	4.24	3.39
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	3	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	164/ 233	3.88	4.07	4.09	4.56	3.88
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	176/ 244	3.82	4.12	4.09	4.09	3.82
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	138/ 227	4.44	4.49	4.40	4.66	4.44
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	151/ 225	4.11	4.40	4.23	4.69	4.11
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	3	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	153/ 207	3.71	4.22	4.09	4.40	3.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	2	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.46	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	3.16	****

Course-Section: MAED 502 8720  
 Title GEOMETRY & SPATIAL REA  
 Instructor: HANNA, DELLA  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 976  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						