Course-Section: VPA 121H 0101

Title INTRODUCTION TO ARTS I

Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 23

Baltimore County Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Page 1471 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	_	encie		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	5	1	7	7	3	3.09	1443/1481	3.09	4.41	4.29	4.14	3.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	7	7	4	4	3.13	1406/1481	3.13	4.16	4.23	4.18	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1249	****	4.75	4.27	4.14	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	10	5	4	3.41	1298/1424	3.41	4.23	4.21	4.06	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	3	2	2	2	3.33	1167/1396	3.33	4.19	3.98	3.89	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	7	4	4	3.04	1263/1342	3.04	4.32	4.07	3.88	3.04
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	1	3	8	3	2	3.12	1366/1459	3.12	3.94	4.16	4.17	3.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	9	4.41	1114/1480	4.41	4.36	4.68	4.64	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	0	8	8	0	3.22	1314/1450	3.22	4.18	4.09	3.97	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	5	6	5	3.78	1245/1409	3.78	4.44	4.42	4.36	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	785/1407		4.92	4.69	4.57	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	5	6	5		1156/1399	3.78	4.41	4.26	4.23	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	4	2	10	2		1217/1400		4.30	4.27	4.19	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	0	2	3	11	4.35	372/1179	4.35	4.55	3.96	3.85	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	6	7	3.89	803/1262	3.89	4.63	4.05	3.77	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	809/1259	4.21	4.78	4.29	4.06	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	704/1256		4.89	4.30	4.08	4.37
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	2	2	4	2	4	3.33	671/ 788		3.62	4.00		3.33
1. Were special eccuriques successful	1	-	2	2	1	,	1	3.33	0717 700	3.33	3.02	1.00	3.00	3.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.54	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.53	4.18	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.17	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	5.00	4.35	4.14	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	3.00	3.92	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	12			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22	-		_	
				?	2						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Course-Section: VPA 225 0101

33

IDEAS IN TH ARTS

MILAD, JACKIE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 21

land Page 1472 y JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	11	8	4.29	805/1481	4.76	4.41	4.29	4.40	4.29
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	12	7	4.24	843/1481	4.41	4.16	4.23	4.29	4.24
		uestions reflect		_	0	17	0	0	0	0	4		****/1249	5.00	4.75	4.27	4.36	****
	_	uations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	416/1424	4.67	4.23	4.21	4.28	4.52
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	4	11	4.24		4.41	4.19	3.98	3.94	4.24
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	6	8	4.10	695/1342	4.70	4.32	4.07	4.05	4.10
		g system clearly		_	0	0	0	0	6	7	8	4.10	914/1459	3.70	3.94	4.16	4.17	4.10
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	17	2	4.11	1324/1480	4.04	4.36	4.68	4.68	4.11
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	6	5	6	4.00	836/1450	4.33	4.18	4.09	4.15	4.00
		Lecture			_		_		_	_								
		uctor's lectures			2	0	1	0	3	-/	8		1122/1409		4.44		4.47	4.11
		ctor seem inter		_	3	0	0	0	1	1		4.83	659/1407	4.92	4.92	4.69	4.78	4.83
		_		xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	723/1399	4.43	4.41	4.26	4.29	4.37
		es contribute to			3	0	0	2	2	4		4.22	890/1400	4.49		4.27		4.22
5. Did au	idiovisua.	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	4	1	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	315/1179	4.47	4.55	3.96	4.05	4.44
		Discus	zion															
1 Did cl	agg digg			what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	381/1262	4.82	4.63	4.05	4.11	4.47
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0			4.73	380/1259	4.91	4.78	4.29	4.34	4.73
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	151/1256	4.98	4.89	4.30	4.28	4.93
		echniques succes		a open arboabbion	6	1	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	159/ 788		3.62	4.00		4.57
	_												,					
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	1									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 12		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	 ajor	 s	7	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 7			_			-						_		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	neral	_				2	Under-g	rad 2	:1	Non-	major	20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	0						
				? 0														

Course-Section: VPA 225 0102

Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS

Instructor:

Enrollment: 5

MILAD, JACKIE (Instr. A)

Questionnaires: 4

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1473 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1481	4.76	4.41	4.29	4.40	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	517/1481		4.16	4.23	4.29	4.50
		uestions reflect			0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249		4.75	4.27	4.36	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	217/1424		4.23	4.21	4.28	4.75
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1396		4.19	3.98	3.94	4.50
	_	_		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342		4.32	4.07	4.05	5.00
		g system clearly			0	0	0	1	1	1	1		1256/1459		3.94	4.16	4.17	3.50
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.04	4.36	4.68	4.68	4.00
				ching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67			4.18	4.09	4.15	4.67
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures		prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	559/1409	4.59	4.44	4.42	4.47	4.83
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407		4.92	4.69	4.78	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	567/1399		4.41	4.26	4.29	4.50
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1400	4.49	4.30	4.27	4.34	4.75
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	259/1179		4.55	3.96	4.05	4.50
		Discuss	sion															
l. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1262	4.82	4.63	4.05	4.11	5.00
					0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1259		4.78	4.29	4.34	5.00
	<pre>11 students actively encouraged t e instructor encourage fair and o</pre>				0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	4.98	4.89	4.30	4.28	5.00
		echniques succes		0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	533/ 788			4.00		3.75	
		Laborat	cory															
1. Did th	e lab ind	crease understar		of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 246	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.51	5.00
				ground information	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	230/ 249	3.00	3.00	4.11	4.32	3.00
		Seminar	î															
2. Was th	e instru	ctor available f	or ind	lividual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.83	5.00
4. Did pr	esentatio	ons contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	5.00
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading made	e clear	•	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	57/ 68	3.00	3.00	3.92	3.55	3.00
		Field V	Vork															
1. Did fi	eld expe	rience contribut	e to v	hat you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 59	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.67	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0						or Ma			1	 Graduat		0	Majo		1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		r.e.	quil!	EU I	⊃⊥ I⁴Ic	JOIS	>	_	Graduat	C	U	Ma J) <u>T</u>	T
28-55 56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Car	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad	4	Mos	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	1	D 0		Ge.	nera.	т				4	onder-9	ıau	7	MOI1-	-ıııa JOE	3
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	0	D 0 F 0		רים.	ecti	700				0	#### -	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	U	P 0		E1	ECLI,	ves				U	#### - respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her					1	respons	es to L	e sign	ıııcaı	16	
				1 0		OC.	ner.					т						

Course-Section: VPA 225 0102 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006

IDEAS IN TH ARTS Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 4

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 1474

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1481 4.76 4.41 4.29 4.40 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 03 4.50 517/1481 4.41 4.16 4.23 4.29 4.50 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1249 5.00 4.75 4.27 4.36 5.00 0 0 1 3 4.75 217/1424 4.67 4.23 4.21 4.28 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 297/1396 4.41 4.19 3.98 3.94 4.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned $0 \quad 0$ 0 0 4 5.00 1/1342 4.70 4.32 4.07 4.05 5.00 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 1 1 3.50 1256/1459 3.70 3.94 4.16 4.17 3.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 4 0 4.00 1349/1480 4.04 4.36 4.68 4.68 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1409 4.59 4.44 4.42 4.47 4.83 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1262 4.82 4.63 4.05 4.11 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1259 4.91 4.78 4.29 4.34 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1256 4.98 4.89 4.30 4.28 5.00 0 0 4. Were special techniques successful 0 1 2 3.75 533/ 788 4.02 3.62 4.00 3.98 3.75 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 246 5.00 5.00 4.20 4.51 5.00 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 230/249 3.00 3.00 4.11 4.32 3.00 Seminar 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 69 5.00 5.00 4.53 4.83 5.00 0 0 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3 0 1 5.00 1/ 69 5.00 5.00 4.35 4.72 5.00 0 0 0 0 3 0 0 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Ω 1 0 0 3.00 57/ 68 3.00 3.00 3.92 3.55 3.00 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 59 5.00 5.00 4.30 4.67 5.00 Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	 Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	4	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: VPA 325 0201 University of Maryland Title CONTEMP ART IN PROCESS

0

2

I ?

Baltimore County BOAZ, HEATHER Spring 2006

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 14

Instructor:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1475

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	340/1481	4.44	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.71
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	349/1481	4.32	4.16	4.23	4.23	4.64
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1249	4.50	4.75	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	161/1424	4.22	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.85
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	363/1396	4.55	4.19	3.98	4.00	4.43
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	257/1342	4.54	4.32	4.07	4.12	4.57
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	1	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	635/1459	4.19	3.94	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	928/1480	4.35	4.36	4.68	4.65	4.69
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	609/1450	4.34	4.18	4.09	4.10	4.27
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	367/1409	4.56	4.44	4.42	4.43	4.79
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.92	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	311/1399	4.69	4.41	4.26	4.27	4.71
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	274/1400	4.48	4.30	4.27	4.28	4.79
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	120/1179	4.73	4.55	3.96	4.02	4.79
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	330/1262	4.52	4.63	4.05	4.14	4.54
2. Were a	ill stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	422/1259	4.76	4.78	4.29	4.34	4.69
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	173/1256	4.96	4.89	4.30	4.34	4.92
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful		1	6	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	278/ 788	3.14	3.62	4.00	4.07	4.29
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27						Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0			- *				_				_	_	_				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0		Ger	nera	Τ				3	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	12	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0										. =				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0 P 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1 respons				_	jh
													_		_			

Other

Course-Section: VPA 325 0301 University of Maryland CONTEMP ART IN PROCESS Baltimore County

Enrollment:

7

Title JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Instructor: BOAZ, HEATHER Job IRBR3029

Page 1476

							Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	947/1481	4.44	4.41	4.29	4.29	4.17
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	0	3		1000/1481		4.16	4.23	4.23	4.00
		uestions reflec			0	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	893/1249		4.75	4.27	4.28	4.00
	_	uations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	3	1	1		1242/1424		4.23	4.21	4.27	3.60
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	193/1396		4.19	3.98	4.00	4.67
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4		303/1342		4.32	4.07	4.12	4.50
		g system clearl			0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	961/1459	4.19	3.94	4.16	4.17	4.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.35	4.36	4.68	4.65	4.00
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	473/1450	4.34	4.18	4.09	4.10	4.40
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	968/1409		4.44	4.42	4.43	4.33
		ctor seem inter		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407		4.92	4.69	4.67	5.00
		_		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	376/1399		4.41	4.26	4.27	4.67
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	937/1400		4.30	4.27	4.28	4.17
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	177/1179	4.73	4.55	3.96	4.02	4.67
		- '																
1 5 1 1		Discus			•	0	0	-	0	0	_	4 50	245/1060	4 50	4 60	4 05	4 1 4	4 50
				what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	345/1262		4.63	4.05	4.14	4.50
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	276/1259		4.78	4.29	4.34	4.83
		_		d open discussion	0	0	0 1	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1256		4.89	4.30	4.34	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssiul		0	4	Τ	U	1	0	0	2.00	781/ 788	3.14	3.62	4.00	4.07	2.00
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4		Per	 สมร์ ห		or Ma	iore		0	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		1/6/	darr.	Lu I	J_ 11C	. 101 2	,	U	Graduat	_	U	Ma JC	, <u>.</u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		061	iici a.	-				_	onaci -g.	Luu	•	14011		J
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		E14	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	ιh
oraa.	Ü	3.30 1.00	J	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		O+1	her					4	10050110					
				2 0		OCI						-						
				. 0														

Course-Section: VPA 410 0101 University of Maryland Title CAPSTONE PROJ INTERART Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 1

	Evaluation	

Page 1477

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Insti	ructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	.k	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	481	5.00	4.41	4.29	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	481	5.00	4.16	4.23	4.32	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	342	5.00	4.32	4.07	4.21	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	459	5.00	3.94	4.16	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	480	5.00	4.36	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	450	5.00	4.18	4.09	4.28	5.00
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	262	5.00	4.63	4.05	4.33	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	259	5.00	4.78	4.29	4.57	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	256	5.00	4.89	4.30	4.60	5.00
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	55	5.00	5.00	4.55	4.86	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	48/	51	3.00	3.00	4.65	4.71	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	34	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	24	5.00	5.00	4.82	5.00	5.00
Frequ	.ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n										

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

Course-Section: VPA 488 0101 University of Maryla Title TOPICS INTERARTS STUD Baltimore County Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE Spring 2006

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

11

University of Maryland Page 1478
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		0	_		NTD	377		_	ncie:		_		tructor		-		Level	
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	6	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.41	4.29	4.45	4.00
_	_	ctor make clear			6	0	1	0	1	1	1		1384/1481		4.16	4.23	4.32	3.25
		uestions reflect	-		6	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.75	4.27	4.44	****
	_	uations reflect		_	6	0	0	0	2	1	1		1186/1424	3.75	4.23	4.21	4.35	3.75
				what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1		3.67	985/1396		4.19	3.98	4.09	3.67
				o what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1186/1342	3.33	4.32	4.07	4.21	3.33
		g system clearly			7	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1459	***	3.94	4.16	4.25	****
		was class cance			7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.36	4.68	4.74	4.67
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1160/1450	3.67	4.18	4.09	4.28	3.67
	-	_		_														
		Lecture	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well j	prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1409	****	4.44	4.42	4.51	****
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1407	****	4.92	4.69	4.79	****
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	d and ex	xplained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1399	****	4.41	4.26	4.36	****
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1400	****	4.30	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1179	***	4.55	3.96	4.07	****
		_	_															
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1262	****	4.63	4.05	4.33	****
2. Were a	ıll stude	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1259	****	4.78	4.29	4.57	****
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage :	fair and	d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1256	****	4.89	4.30	4.60	****
4. Were s	special to	echniques succes	ssful		8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	3.62	4.00	4.26	****
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	guir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			_											
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	LO	Non-	-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	_J h
				P 0									respons	es to k	oe sign	ificar	ıt	•
				I 0		Ot1	her					0	-					
				? 0														