

Course-Section: MAED 501 8720
 Title PROBLEM SOLVING
 Instructor: KELLY, BRIAN W
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 949
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	6	8	4.38	767/1522	4.38	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	2	9	4.06	1048/1522	4.06	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	7	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.52	4.30	4.31	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	316/1412	4.55	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	4	6	3.80	1016/1381	3.80	4.28	4.08	4.25	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1277/1497	3.50	4.24	4.11	4.21	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	953/1440	4.38	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	737/1448	4.81	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	9	4.13	977/1432	4.13	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	899/1221	3.50	3.74	3.93	3.83	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	337/1280	4.58	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	567/1277	4.55	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	2	0	7	3.91	960/1269	3.91	4.65	4.31	4.51	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	363/ 854	4.20	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.72	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	****	4.33	4.35	4.39	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.76	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.40	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.35	4.58	4.76	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.74	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.43	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.38	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.55	4.30	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.56	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.30	4.82	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Electives 0
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0	
				I 0	Other 10
				? 0	

Course-Section: MAED 501S 2301
 Title
 Instructor: DUDEK, SHARON
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 950
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	7	2	4.10	1054/1522	4.40	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	128/1522	4.78	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	125/1476	4.78	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	621/1412	4.28	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	556/1381	4.48	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1500	4.71	4.35	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	4.96	4.72	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1049/1497	4.39	4.24	4.11	4.21	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	192/1440	4.70	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	494/1448	4.95	4.86	4.71	4.80	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	123/1436	4.70	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	294/1432	4.69	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	430/1221	4.09	3.74	3.93	3.83	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	442/1280	4.72	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.61	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.65	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	228/ 854	4.60	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.44	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.72	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	135/ 228	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.39	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.76	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.40	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.35	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.55	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.74	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.43	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.38	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	Other 10
				? 0	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MAED 501S 2302
 Title
 Instructor: BARNES, BILL
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 951
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	9	4.69	404/1522	4.40	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	358/1522	4.78	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	316/1476	4.78	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	466/1412	4.28	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	207/1381	4.48	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	615/1500	4.71	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	389/1517	4.96	4.72	4.65	4.73	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	112/1497	4.39	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	798/1440	4.70	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1448	4.95	4.86	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	601/1436	4.70	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	548/1432	4.69	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	714/1221	4.09	3.74	3.93	3.83	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1280	4.72	4.40	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.61	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.65	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	106/ 854	4.60	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.72	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 228	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.39	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.51	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.76	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 205	****	****	4.23	4.40	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.77	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.55	4.30	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: MAED 504 8720
 Title STAT/DATA ANALY/PROB
 Instructor: AGREEN, LINDA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 952
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	15	4.79	275/1522	4.79	4.42	4.30	4.45	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	171/1522	4.84	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	298/1285	4.74	4.52	4.30	4.31	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	197/1476	4.79	4.43	4.22	4.31	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	529/1412	4.29	4.10	4.06	4.25	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.28	4.08	4.25	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	65/1500	4.95	4.35	4.18	4.22	4.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.72	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.24	4.11	4.21	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	115/1440	4.94	4.52	4.45	4.48	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.86	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	341/1436	4.72	4.46	4.29	4.37	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	187/1432	4.89	4.34	4.29	4.33	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	380/1221	4.38	3.74	3.93	3.83	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	147/1280	4.88	4.40	4.10	4.24	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	137/1277	4.94	4.61	4.34	4.52	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	156/1269	4.94	4.65	4.31	4.51	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	177/ 854	4.56	4.29	4.02	4.08	4.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.72	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.35	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.55	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.74	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.43	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.33	4.11	4.38	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.77	4.41	4.40	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	14	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						