

Course-Section: MAED 503 1
 Title Algebraic Reasoning
 Instructor: Albright, Debora
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 945
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	2	8	12	4.45	661/1509	4.45	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	621/1509	4.45	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	208/1287	4.80	4.74	4.30	4.22	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	17	4.64	313/1459	4.64	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	6	7	3.77	1030/1406	3.77	4.29	4.09	4.12	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	10	8	4.18	685/1384	4.18	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	597/1489	4.41	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	8	4.35	523/1463	4.35	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	219/1438	4.91	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	508/1411	4.59	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	11	4.45	696/1405	4.45	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	7	7	6	3.77	841/1236	3.77	4.04	4.00	3.98	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	370/1260	4.57	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	602/1255	4.48	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	409/1258	4.76	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	270/ 873	4.38	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MAED 505 1
 Title Advanced Algebra/Trig
 Instructor: Ruehl, Bryan Sco
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 946
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	1	3	13	4.71	363/1509	4.71	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	311/1509	4.71	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	444/1287	4.59	4.74	4.30	4.22	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	378/1459	4.57	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	313/1406	4.53	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	199/1384	4.70	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	364/1489	4.59	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	957/1506	4.65	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	0	14	4.65	617/1438	4.65	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	1	2	12	4.29	849/1411	4.29	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	486/1405	4.65	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	635/1236	4.06	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	1	11	4.38	528/1260	4.38	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	638/1255	4.44	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	690/1258	4.44	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	317/ 873	4.29	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 7 Major 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 10 Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

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	1	3	17	4.76	291/1509	4.76	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	158/1509	4.86	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	403/1287	4.63	4.74	4.30	4.22	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	432/1459	4.52	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	135/1406	4.80	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	149/1384	4.75	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	208/1489	4.74	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	271/1463	4.58	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	110/1438	4.95	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	69/1411	4.95	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	172/1405	4.90	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.04	4.00	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	16	4.65	316/1260	4.65	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	540/1255	4.55	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	236/1258	4.90	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	93/ 873	4.80	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.80
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.60	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.31	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 48	****	4.81	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 48	****	4.64	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.71	4.51	4.43	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.37	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.25	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	4	A 10	Required for Majors 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	Graduate 12
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	Major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	General 0
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Under-grad 9
				P 0	Non-major 4
					Electives 0
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	1
?	0		