Course Section: HUM 120H 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO HUMANITIES I Baltimore County Instructor: FREYMAN, JAY M (Instr. A) Fall 2006

University of Maryland Page 1054

Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007

. A) Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies				3		Inst	tructor Course Dep			t UMBC Level		Sect				
Questions					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	1	7	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.67	4.23	4.02	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	0	6	0	3	0		1624/1666	2.67	2.67	4.19	4.11	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						3	0	2	0	4	0		1292/1421	3.33	3.33	4.24	4.11	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	958/1617	4.11	4.11	4.15	3.99	4.11
			_	hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1555	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.92	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1285/1543	3.44	3.44	4.06	3.86	3.44
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y explai	ned -	0	1	5	2	1	0	0	1.50	1636/1647	1.50	1.50	4.12	4.06	1.50
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	965/1668	4.75	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.75
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	373/1605	4.19	4.19	4.07	3.96	4.19
		Lecture	е															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1514	****	****	4.39	4.32	****
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested in	the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1551	4.33	4.33	4.66	4.55	4.33
				plained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1503	****	****	4.24	4.17	****
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	o what y	ou learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1506		****	4.26	4.17	****
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	nance yo	our understanding	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1311	****	****	3.85	3.68	****
		Discus																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	5	4		512/1490			4.05	3.85	4.44
				l to participate	0	0	0	1	3	0	5		1013/1502	4.00	4.00	4.26	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	0	0	0	7	2	0		1367/1489	3.22	3.22	4.29	4.07	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful				0	1	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	657/1006	3.75	3.75	4.00	3.81	3.75	
				Freq	uency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades					Reasons							Туре			Majors			
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4				Red	Required for Majors 0 Graduate						0	Majo	r .r	0				
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		Required for Majors										3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		General					0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	9	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		301101 01										3		
Grad.	0					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	s there are not enough			
P 0													respons				_	
				I 0		Other						8	-					
				? 0														

Course Section: HUM 120H 0101 Title INTRO TO HUMANITIES I

University of Maryland Page 1055 Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Fall 2006 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: SPITZ, ELLEN (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 9

C+	a	The second second second	0
Student	course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Ouestions			NR	NA	Fr	eque: 2	ncies	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean			
Žace e 1 0110																			
General																			
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course					0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.67	4.23	4.02	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	0	6	0	3	0	2.67	1624/1666	2.67	2.67	4.19	4.11	2.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						3	0	2	0	4	0	3.33	1292/1421	3.33	3.33	4.24	4.11	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	958/1617	4.11	4.11	4.15	3.99	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1555	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.92	5.00	
6. Did wr:	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1285/1543	3.44	3.44	4.06	3.86	3.44	
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	5	2	1	0	0	1.50	1636/1647	1.50	1.50	4.12	4.06	1.50	
	-	was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	2	6		965/1668	4.75	4.75	4.67	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					0	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1116/1605	4.19	4.19	4.07	3.96	4.19	
_		Lectur	-	_	_	_			_	_									
		uctor's lecture			7	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1514		****	4.39	4.32	****	
		ctor seem inter			6	0	0	0	1	0	2		1304/1551	4.33	4.33	4.66	4.55	4.33	
				xplained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1503	****	****	4.24	4.17	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					7	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1506	****	****	4.26	4.17	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1311	****	****	3.85	3.68	****	
		Discus																	
1 Did ala	aga diga			what was laamad	0	0	0	0	0	_	1	1 11	512/1490	4.44	4.44	4.05	3.85	4.44	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	1	3	0	5		1013/1502	4.44	4.44	4.05	4.06	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	0	0	0	3 7	2	0		1367/1489	3.22	3.22	4.29	4.00	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful				0	1	1	0	1	Δ Δ	2				3.75	4.00	3.81	3.75		
T. WEIE B	peciai co	eciniiques succe	ssiui		U		_	U		-	2	3.73	037/1000	3.73	3.73	4.00	3.01	3.73	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons Type Maj							Majors	\$					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Required for Ma				iors	 3	0	Graduate 0 Major			 r	0		
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		inequired for hajorb										5			
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 1				Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	9			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 1					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	#### - Means there are not enough						
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt		
				I 0		Other						8							