

Course-Section: VPA 120H 0101  
 Title INTRO TO THE ARTS I  
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1671  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	2	0	9	8	7	3.69	1434/1674	3.69	4.30	4.27	4.07	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	8	5	5	7	3.35	1556/1674	3.35	4.33	4.23	4.16	3.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1423	****	4.76	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	8	7	7	3.71	1355/1609	3.71	4.39	4.22	4.05	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	2	2	5	4	2	3.13	1411/1585	3.13	4.17	3.96	3.88	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	9	8	4	3.35	1352/1535	3.35	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	8	1	3	7	0	7	3.50	1442/1651	3.50	4.12	4.18	4.10	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.88	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	7	9	2	3.55	1353/1656	3.55	4.13	4.07	3.96	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	7	2	12	4.04	1280/1586	4.04	4.71	4.43	4.37	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	284/1585	4.96	4.97	4.69	4.60	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	11	8	4.13	1052/1582	4.13	4.68	4.26	4.17	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	11	6	3.87	1235/1575	3.87	4.57	4.27	4.17	3.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	3	9	9	4.18	549/1380	4.18	4.70	3.94	3.78	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	7	12	4.12	760/1520	4.12	4.67	4.01	3.76	4.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	5	4	15	4.32	837/1515	4.32	4.73	4.24	3.97	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	5	5	15	4.40	751/1511	4.40	4.78	4.27	4.00	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	2	1	4	5	8	3.80	614/ 994	3.80	4.35	3.94	3.73	3.80	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	3.69	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0
				P 8	
				I 0	Other 20
				? 1	

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: VPA 225 0101  
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS  
 Instructor: BOAZ, HEATHER  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1672  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1139/1674	4.51	4.30	4.27	4.32	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	641/1674	4.66	4.33	4.23	4.26	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	819/1423	4.76	4.76	4.27	4.36	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	825/1609	4.61	4.39	4.22	4.23	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	769/1585	4.51	4.17	3.96	3.91	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	2	7	3.92	991/1535	4.33	4.08	4.08	4.03	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	598/1651	4.33	4.12	4.18	4.20	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	565/1673	4.84	4.88	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	955/1656	4.32	4.13	4.07	4.10	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	214/1586	4.93	4.71	4.43	4.48	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1585	4.98	4.97	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	353/1582	4.87	4.68	4.26	4.35	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	407/1575	4.80	4.57	4.27	4.39	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	114/1380	4.87	4.70	3.94	4.03	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	145/1520	4.85	4.67	4.01	4.03	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1515	4.86	4.73	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	266/1511	4.91	4.78	4.27	4.28	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	86/ 994	4.53	4.35	3.94	3.98	4.86	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.23	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 13	Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	4	
?	0			

Course-Section: VPA 225 0201  
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS  
 Instructor: OBER, CARA  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1673  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	1	6	4.86	195/1674	4.51	4.30	4.27	4.32	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1674	4.66	4.33	4.23	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	4.76	4.76	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1609	4.61	4.39	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	4.51	4.17	3.96	3.91	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	200/1535	4.33	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	934/1651	4.33	4.12	4.18	4.20	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	4.84	4.88	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	214/1656	4.32	4.13	4.07	4.10	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1586	4.93	4.71	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1585	4.98	4.97	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1582	4.87	4.68	4.26	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1575	4.80	4.57	4.27	4.39	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1380	4.87	4.70	3.94	4.03	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	4.85	4.67	4.01	4.03	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1515	4.86	4.73	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1511	4.91	4.78	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	89/ 994	4.53	4.35	3.94	3.98	4.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 259	****	****	4.33	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.20	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	****	3.93	4.20	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 61	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.23	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.26	4.53	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: VPA 225 0201  
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS  
 Instructor: OBER, CARA  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1673  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: VPA 225 0301  
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS  
 Instructor: BOAZ, HEATHER  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1674  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	2	3	12	4.59	509/1674	4.51	4.30	4.27	4.32	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	554/1674	4.66	4.33	4.23	4.26	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1423	4.76	4.76	4.27	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	420/1609	4.61	4.39	4.22	4.23	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	313/1585	4.51	4.17	3.96	3.91	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	558/1535	4.33	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	768/1651	4.33	4.12	4.18	4.20	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1148/1673	4.84	4.88	4.69	4.67	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	719/1656	4.32	4.13	4.07	4.10	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	266/1586	4.93	4.71	4.43	4.48	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	397/1585	4.98	4.97	4.69	4.76	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	180/1582	4.87	4.68	4.26	4.35	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	467/1575	4.80	4.57	4.27	4.39	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	110/1380	4.87	4.70	3.94	4.03	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	295/1520	4.85	4.67	4.01	4.03	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	560/1515	4.86	4.73	4.24	4.28	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	323/1511	4.91	4.78	4.27	4.28	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	568/ 994	4.53	4.35	3.94	3.98	3.91	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 265	****	****	4.23	4.34	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 260	****	****	4.46	4.51	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 103	****	****	4.41	4.07	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	****	4.48	4.45	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 95	****	****	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 99	****	****	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	3.98	3.97	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.45	4.50	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.12	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.36	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.34	4.50	****	

Course-Section: VPA 225 0301  
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS  
 Instructor: BOAZ, HEATHER  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1674  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						