

Course-Section: HUM 121H 0101
 Title INTRO TO HUMANITIES II
 Instructor: KASSNER, JOSHUA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 911
 JUN 13, 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	1	2	3	9	4.13	986/1481	4.13	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	9	3	3.75	1205/1481	3.75	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	2	7	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	5	2	3	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	999/1342	3.73	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	929/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	10	2	3.88	997/1450	3.77	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	762/1409	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	941/1407	4.68	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	947/1399	4.26	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	741/1400	4.25	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	1	7	3	3.85	732/1179	3.72	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	1	9	4.15	638/1262	4.15	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	3	1	0	9	4.15	841/1259	4.15	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	742/1256	4.31	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	755/ 788	2.60	4.03	4.00	3.80	2.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	47/ 68	4.43	4.66	4.49	4.54	4.43	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	56/ 69	4.14	4.26	4.53	4.18	4.14	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	37/ 63	4.43	4.24	4.44	4.17	4.43	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	46/ 69	4.14	4.19	4.35	4.14	4.14	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	41/ 68	3.86	3.98	3.92	3.80	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HUM 121H 0101
 Title INTRO TO HUMANITIES II
 Instructor: WILLARD, JOHN D (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 912
 JUN 13, 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	1	2	3	9	4.13	986/1481	4.13	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	9	3	3.75	1205/1481	3.75	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	2	7	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	5	2	3	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	4	4	5	3.73	999/1342	3.73	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	929/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	11	0	3.67	1160/1450	3.77	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	891/1409	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	963/1407	4.68	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	683/1399	4.26	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	961/1400	4.25	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	3	2	4	5	3.60	860/1179	3.72	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	1	9	4.15	638/1262	4.15	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	3	1	0	9	4.15	841/1259	4.15	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	742/1256	4.31	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	755/ 788	2.60	4.03	4.00	3.80	2.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	47/ 68	4.43	4.66	4.49	4.54	4.43	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	56/ 69	4.14	4.26	4.53	4.18	4.14	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	37/ 63	4.43	4.24	4.44	4.17	4.43	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	46/ 69	4.14	4.19	4.35	4.14	4.14	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	41/ 68	3.86	3.98	3.92	3.80	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						