

Course-Section: MAED 527 1  
 Title Cult Resp Inst In Math  
 Instructor: Barnes,William  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 908  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

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	2	24	4.85	201/1447	4.93	4.35	4.31	4.46	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	228/1447	3.89	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	21	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1241	****	4.66	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	107/1402	3.94	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	4	19	4.50	345/1358	3.75	4.17	4.11	4.26	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	128/1316	4.90	4.37	4.14	4.34	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	219/1427	4.37	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	19	4.76	819/1447	4.38	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	93/1434	4.94	4.14	4.10	4.21	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	160/1387	4.46	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	55/1386	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	64/1380	4.98	4.34	4.32	4.38	4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	72/1193	4.44	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	50/1172	4.98	4.42	4.15	4.32	4.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	158/1182	4.96	4.61	4.35	4.46	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.10	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	4.67	4.34	4.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.67	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	4.67	4.48	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	4.67	4.33	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	4.74	4.58	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 62	5.00	4.56	4.56	4.69	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	2	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.52	4.41	4.75	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	4.50	4.42	4.64	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	21/ 64	4.55	4.35	4.09	4.18	4.55
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.55	4.49	4.77	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.19	4.25	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.68	4.52	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.39	4.30	4.66	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	4.50	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.75	4.64	4.59	****

Course-Section: MAED 527 1  
 Title Cult Resp Inst In Math  
 Instructor: Barnes, William  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 908  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	26	Required for Majors	26	Graduate	16	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	16	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MAED 527 2  
 Title Cult Resp Inst In Math  
 Instructor: Barnes,William  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 909  
 JUN 28, 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	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.93	4.35	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1400/1447	3.89	4.30	4.27	4.30	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1359/1402	3.94	4.38	4.24	4.29	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1291/1358	3.75	4.17	4.11	4.26	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	4.90	4.37	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	971/1427	4.37	4.33	4.19	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.38	4.79	4.69	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.94	4.14	4.10	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1176/1387	4.46	4.47	4.46	4.51	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1386	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.98	4.34	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	652/1193	4.44	4.06	4.02	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	4.98	4.42	4.15	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	4.96	4.61	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.10	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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