

Course-Section: HUM 120H 0101
 Title INTRO TO HUMANITIES I
 Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1015
 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	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	274/1649	4.81	4.81	4.28	4.11	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	6	4.10	1070/1648	4.10	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	1	0	0	4.00	****/1375	****	****	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	996/1595	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.03	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	249/1533	4.65	4.65	4.04	3.87	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	564/1512	4.37	4.37	4.10	3.86	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	3	7	4	4	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	3.50	4.16	4.08	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	1221/1646	4.47	4.47	4.69	4.67	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	252/1621	4.27	4.27	4.06	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	147/1568	4.86	4.86	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	355/1572	4.98	4.97	4.70	4.64	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	7	12	4.50	651/1564	4.42	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	261/1559	4.59	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	848/1352	3.86	3.86	3.98	3.86	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	275/1384	4.72	4.72	4.08	3.86	4.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.50	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.67	4.30	4.01	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	12	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	3.75	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	19	
			? 1			

Course-Section: HUM 120H 0101
 Title INTRO TO HUMANITIES I
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1016
 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	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	274/1649	4.81	4.81	4.28	4.11	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	6	4.10	1070/1648	4.10	4.10	4.23	4.16	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1375	****	****	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	996/1595	4.11	4.11	4.20	4.03	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	249/1533	4.65	4.65	4.04	3.87	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	10	8	4.37	564/1512	4.37	4.37	4.10	3.86	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	3	7	4	4	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	3.50	4.16	4.08	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	9	4.47	1221/1646	4.47	4.47	4.69	4.67	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1060/1621	4.27	4.27	4.06	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	442/1568	4.86	4.86	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	4.98	4.97	4.70	4.64	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	854/1564	4.42	4.42	4.28	4.20	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	901/1559	4.59	4.59	4.29	4.20	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1352	3.86	3.86	3.98	3.86	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	275/1384	4.72	4.72	4.08	3.86	4.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.50	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.67	4.30	4.01	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	12	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	3.75	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P	0						
			I	0	Other	19				
			?	1						