

Course-Section: MAED 502 8720
 Title GEOMETRY & SPATIAL REA
 Instructor: IMWOLD, JANICE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1104
 JAN 21, 2006
 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		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1296/1674	4.37	4.23	4.27	4.44	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	1	3.86	1305/1674	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1088/1423	4.46	4.36	4.27	4.28	3.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	3	3.93	1198/1609	4.31	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	3	2	5	2	3.31	1344/1585	3.62	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	8	3	1	3.21	1402/1535	3.83	4.08	4.08	4.27	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	276/1651	4.82	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	805/1656	4.28	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	1120/1586	4.33	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	10	2	3.86	1244/1582	4.18	4.30	4.26	4.33	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	1138/1575	4.38	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	944/1380	3.71	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	1104/1520	4.17	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	0	2	10	4.43	733/1515	4.68	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	937/1511	4.54	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	312/ 994	4.55	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.36
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.42	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.66	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.56	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.26	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.31	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 5
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 15
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 0	Other 10

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MAED 502 8721
 Title GEOMETRY & SPATIAL REA
 Instructor: BARNES, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1105
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	13	4.81	233/1674	4.37	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	207/1674	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1423	4.46	4.36	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	292/1609	4.31	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	879/1585	3.62	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	467/1535	3.83	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	81/1651	4.82	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	548/1656	4.28	4.06	4.07	4.15	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	1034/1586	4.33	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	632/1582	4.18	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	359/1575	4.38	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	1	0	4	7	3.73	916/1380	3.71	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	281/1520	4.17	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	145/1515	4.68	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	278/1511	4.54	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	115/ 994	4.55	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 265	****	4.06	4.23	4.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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 505 8020
 Title ADVANCED ALGEBRA/TRIG
 Instructor: EBERSOLE, ERIC
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1106
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	1056/1674	4.10	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	2	2	4	10	4.22	968/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	648/1423	4.23	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	3	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	715/1609	4.14	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	6	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	642/1585	3.73	4.04	3.96	4.23	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	3	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	481/1535	4.19	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	1	0	0	0	16	4.76	220/1651	4.71	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	424/1673	4.98	4.65	4.69	4.78	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	2	0	1	3	6	3.92	1107/1656	3.80	4.06	4.07	4.15	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	960/1586	4.24	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1585	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	2	2	2	5	5	3.56	1385/1582	3.79	4.30	4.26	4.33	3.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	1115/1575	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	5	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	622/1380	4.00	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	979/1520	3.88	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	6	2	8	4.13	982/1515	4.33	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	779/1511	4.46	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	732/ 994	3.72	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	4.15	4.06	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 278	4.23	4.21	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	5.00	4.43	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	4.46	4.21	4.33	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	4.50	4.39	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	5.00	4.33	4.48	4.62	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	4.33	4.36	4.39	4.54	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	4.40	3.76	4.14	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

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	1	2	2	5	9	4.00	1196/1674	4.10	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	7	6	3.79	1352/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.34	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	7	3.89	1111/1423	4.23	4.36	4.27	4.28	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1278/1609	4.14	4.23	4.22	4.34	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	0	3	3	3	3.45	1260/1585	3.73	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	643/1535	4.19	4.08	4.08	4.27	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	70/1651	4.71	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1673	4.98	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	3	10	2	3.71	1275/1656	3.80	4.06	4.07	4.15	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	6	3	9	4.05	1275/1586	4.24	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	615/1585	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	3	3	8	3.67	1348/1582	3.79	4.30	4.26	4.33	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	4	9	3.94	1184/1575	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.30	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	852/1380	4.00	3.94	3.94	3.85	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	810/1520	3.88	4.14	4.01	4.19	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	2	13	4.44	707/1515	4.33	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	8	9	4.33	816/1511	4.46	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	3	0	3	6	6	3.67	676/ 994	3.72	3.97	3.94	4.07	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 265	4.15	4.06	4.23	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 278	4.23	4.21	4.19	4.42	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 260	5.00	4.43	4.46	4.67	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	4.46	4.21	4.33	4.66	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	4.38	4.36	4.20	4.53	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	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	13	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MAED 505 8721
 Title ADVANCED ALGEBRA/TRIG
 Instructor: STALEY, JOHN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1108
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	2	7	4.14	1075/1674	4.10	4.23	4.27	4.44	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	750/1423	4.23	4.36	4.27	4.28	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	879/1609	4.14	4.23	4.22	4.34	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	1	6	3.57	1181/1585	3.73	4.04	3.96	4.23	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	5	3.86	1066/1535	4.19	4.08	4.08	4.27	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	643/1651	4.71	4.20	4.18	4.32	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1673	4.98	4.65	4.69	4.78	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	2	6	3	3.77	1230/1656	3.80	4.06	4.07	4.15	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	1160/1586	4.24	4.43	4.43	4.50	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	713/1585	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.79	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	0	2	8	4.15	1034/1582	3.79	4.30	4.26	4.33	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	630/1380	4.00	3.94	3.94	3.85	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	967/1520	3.88	4.14	4.01	4.19	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	746/1515	4.33	4.37	4.24	4.47	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	507/1511	4.46	4.37	4.27	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	2	0	6	4	4.00	474/ 994	3.72	3.97	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	163/ 265	4.15	4.06	4.23	4.51	4.15	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	2	0	4	7	4.23	155/ 278	4.23	4.21	4.19	4.42	4.23	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 260	5.00	4.43	4.46	4.67	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	121/ 259	4.46	4.21	4.33	4.66	4.46	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	4	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	99/ 233	4.38	4.36	4.20	4.53	4.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	56/ 103	4.50	4.39	4.41	4.56	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.33	4.48	4.62	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	59/ 99	4.33	4.36	4.39	4.54	4.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	40/ 97	4.40	3.76	4.14	4.26	4.40	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.19	4.45	4.64	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.35	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.46	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	21/ 61	4.75	4.03	4.09	4.46	4.75	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	20/ 52	4.80	4.21	4.26	4.59	4.80	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.64	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	4.84	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	4.64	****	

Course-Section: MAED 505 8721
 Title ADVANCED ALGEBRA/TRIG
 Instructor: STALEY, JOHN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1108
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	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	12	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						