

Course-Section: MAED 502 8720
 Title GEOMETRY & SPATIAL REA
 Instructor: SMITH, AMY M
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1048
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	4	7	8	3	3.35	1538/1649	3.35	4.44	4.28	4.46	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	8	7	3	3.35	1543/1648	3.35	4.38	4.23	4.34	3.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	6	4	7	5	3.39	1448/1595	3.39	4.42	4.20	4.35	3.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	5	8	4	2	2.78	1491/1533	2.78	4.21	4.04	4.28	2.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	5	8	3	3	2.83	1472/1512	2.83	4.35	4.10	4.35	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	6	9	3.78	1252/1623	3.78	4.34	4.16	4.29	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	597/1646	4.91	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	7	6	1	3.57	1314/1621	3.57	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	891/1568	4.48	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	296/1572	4.96	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	5	10	4	3.61	1360/1564	3.61	4.48	4.28	4.41	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	6	5	5	3.13	1462/1559	3.13	4.37	4.29	4.41	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	5	6	9	3.95	754/1352	3.95	4.09	3.98	4.10	3.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	10	5	3.68	1002/1384	3.68	4.51	4.08	4.30	3.68	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	4	10	7	4.05	936/1382	4.05	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.05	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	7	3	12	4.23	860/1368	4.23	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	173/ 948	4.59	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.59	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	233/ 555	4.86	4.64	4.29	4.66	4.86	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 288	****	3.82	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	2	0	6	0	3.50	217/ 312	3.50	3.95	3.68	3.83	3.50	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 1	A 21	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		23
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	20

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MAED 521 8020
 Title MATHEMATICAL REASONING
 Instructor: FRICK, JERRI
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1049
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1183/1649	4.15	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.13	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1533	4.32	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	883/1512	3.83	4.35	4.10	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.19	4.34	4.16	4.29	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.27	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621	4.02	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.37	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	4.91	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	4.54	4.48	4.28	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	690/1352	3.84	4.09	3.98	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.61	4.51	4.08	4.30	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1382	4.51	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.58	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	203/ 948	4.51	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.50
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	3.86	3.82	3.68	3.87	4.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.68	3.83	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MAED 521 8720
 Title MATHEMATICAL REASONING
 Instructor: FRICK, JERRI
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1050
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	9	13	4.30	922/1649	4.15	4.44	4.28	4.46	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	10	9	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.38	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1375	****	4.54	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	7	13	4.27	806/1595	4.13	4.42	4.20	4.35	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	14	9	4.15	718/1533	4.32	4.21	4.04	4.28	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	8	11	5	3.67	1170/1512	3.83	4.35	4.10	4.35	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	9	10	3.89	1192/1623	4.19	4.34	4.16	4.29	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	26	1	4.04	1532/1646	4.27	4.76	4.69	4.81	4.04	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	16	4	4.04	892/1621	4.02	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	11	11	4.23	1137/1568	4.37	4.52	4.43	4.52	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	815/1572	4.91	4.85	4.70	4.83	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	12	8	4.08	1096/1564	4.54	4.48	4.28	4.41	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	6	7	10	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.37	4.29	4.41	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	5	13	4	3.68	960/1352	3.84	4.09	3.98	4.10	3.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	8	13	4.22	691/1384	4.61	4.51	4.08	4.30	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	7	17	4.52	608/1382	4.51	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	522/1368	4.58	4.73	4.30	4.56	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	199/ 948	4.51	4.36	3.95	4.03	4.52	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	5.00	4.12	4.61	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/ 555	****	4.64	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	6	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.61	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.63	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	4.47	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.53	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	177/ 288	3.86	3.82	3.68	3.87	3.71	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	****/ 312	4.00	3.95	3.68	3.83	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	15	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			Other	26	