Course-Section: HUM 121 1 University of Maryland Title Intro To Humanities II Baltimore County

Baltimore County
A) Spring 2010

Instructor: Rubin, Anne S (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 880

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

	Over the law of				373	Frequencies			S			structor Rank		Course	_		Level	Sect	
Questions				NR 	NA		2	3	- 4 	5	Mean	kan	к 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	1																
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course						0	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	1198/1	447	3.86	3.86	4.31	4.18	3.86
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	0	6	5	2	3.69	1250/1	447	3.69	3.69	4.27	4.30	3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	2	5	5	1	3.38	1292/1	402	3.38	3.38	4.24	4.15	3.38
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	6	5	4.08	761/1	358	4.08	4.08	4.11	4.03	4.08
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1120/1	316	3.54	3.54	4.14	3.99	3.54
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	0	4	3	4	2	3.31	1321/1	427	3.31	3.31	4.19	4.24	3.31
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1	447	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	0	3.92	969/1	434	4.00	4.00	4.10	4.10	4.00
		Lecture	e																
		uctor's lecture			10	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1039/1	387	4.38	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.38
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1143/1	387	4.50	4.50	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1	386	****	****	4.32	4.32	****
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1	380	****	****	4.32	4.31	****
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1	193	****	****	4.02	3.99	****
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1	172	****	****	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1	182	****	****	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1	170	****	****	4.38	4.17	***
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	800	****	****	4.06	3.95	****
		Semina																	
	_	-		announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	47/	66	4.50	4.50	4.58	3.95	4.50
				ividual attention	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	38/	62	4.71	4.71	4.56	4.08	4.71
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	8	2	3.71	52/	58	3.71	3.71	4.41	3.88	3.71
		ons contribute			0	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	51/	65	4.07	4.07	4.42	3.78	4.07
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading made	e clear		0	0	0	0	9	2	3	3.57	49/	64	3.57	3.57	4.09	3.75	3.57
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades					Rea				Reasons					Тур	pe		Majors		5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 0	 A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or M	 aior		8	Gradua		 :e 0		Majo	 or	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 6								-			-	-	) •		,
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Unde	r-ai	rad 1	4	Non-	major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								-						5 2	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0		Ele	Electives					0	#### - Means there are not			enous	7h		
	-	2.22 2.30	-	P 0								-			es to b			_	, .
				I O	Other						0			~			-		
			? 1			-													

Course-Section: HUM 121 1 University of Maryland Title Intro To Humanities II

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Seng, Phillip S (Instr. B) Enrollment:

15 Questionnaires: 14

Page 881 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Frequencies			s		Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General	0	0	•	-	2	_	_	2 06	1100/1445	2 06	2 06	4 21	4 10	2 06	
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Ι	3	-/	3		1198/1447		3.86	4.31	4.18	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	5	2		1250/1447	3.69	3.69	4.27	4.30	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	5	Ţ		1292/1402	3.38	3.38	4.24	4.15	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	6	5		. ,	4.08	4.08	4.11	4.03	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	3	3		1120/1316		3.54	4.14	3.99	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	3	4	2		1321/1427	3.31	3.31	4.19	4.24	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	807/1434	4.00	4.00	4.10	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	798/1387	4.38	4.38	4.46	4.46	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1143/1387	4.50	4.50	4.73	4.71	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1386	****	****	4.32	4.32	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1380	****	****	4.32	4.31	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding			0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1193	****	****	4.02	3.99	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1172			4.15	3.95	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	0		****/1182			4.35	4.18	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1170			4.38	4.17	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	****	****	4.06	3.95	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	Λ	1	5	8	4.50	47/ 66	4.50	4.50	4.58	3.95	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	38/ 62		4.71	4.56	4.08	4.71	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	8	2	3.71	52/ 58		3.71	4.41	3.88	3.71	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	51/ 65		4.07	4.41	3.78	4.07	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	9	2	3	3.57	49/ 64	3.57	3.57	4.42	3.78	3.57	
5. Were directed for grading made crear	U	U	U	U	9	۷	3	3.5/	49/ 04	3.3/	3.5/	4.09	3.75	3.51	

## Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				_	4						