

Course-Section: LAS 121H 0101
 Title INTRODUCTION TO ARTS I
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 997
 JUL 2, 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	0	1	3	9	4.62	485/1576	4.81	4.51	4.30	4.11	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	568/1576	4.70	4.33	4.27	4.18	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	4.50	4.50	4.32	4.19	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	376/1520	4.81	4.35	4.25	4.09	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1465	****	4.27	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	682/1434	4.63	4.42	4.14	3.94	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1145/1547	4.29	4.22	4.19	4.10	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1219/1574	4.62	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	584/1554	4.43	4.24	4.10	4.01	4.36	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	401/1488	4.90	4.55	4.47	4.41	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.95	4.90	4.73	4.65	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	271/1486	4.90	4.54	4.32	4.26	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	309/1489	4.90	4.49	4.32	4.22	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	4.90	4.26	4.03	3.91	5.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.66	4.17	3.96	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.76	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.81	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	589/ 878	4.42	4.28	4.05	3.91	3.83	

Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	4.96	4.03	3.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LAS 121H 0201
 Title INTRODUCTION TO ARTS I
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 998
 JUL 2, 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	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	4.81	4.51	4.30	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	187/1576	4.70	4.33	4.27	4.18	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.50	4.32	4.19	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.35	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	****	4.27	4.12	4.02	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1434	4.63	4.42	4.14	3.94	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	339/1547	4.29	4.22	4.19	4.10	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.62	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	395/1554	4.43	4.24	4.10	4.01	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1488	4.90	4.55	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	4.95	4.90	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1486	4.90	4.54	4.32	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	4.90	4.49	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1277	4.90	4.26	4.03	3.91	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.66	4.17	3.96	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.76	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.81	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	4.42	4.28	4.05	3.91	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.72	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.39	4.01	3.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 7	Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 7		
				? 0			