

Course-Section: VPA 120H 0101
 Title INTRO TO THE ARTS I
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1550
 JAN 19, 2005
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	5	0	3.15	1486/1556	3.15	3.56	4.25	4.06	3.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	6	1	1	2.62	1531/1557	2.62	3.60	4.21	4.13	2.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1335	****	****	4.24	4.13	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	4	0	3.00	1465/1510	3.00	3.70	4.19	4.07	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1479	****	3.91	3.97	3.90	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	4	3	1	3.00	1345/1424	3.00	3.57	4.08	3.91	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	2	1	2	1	3	3.22	1417/1537	3.22	3.51	4.15	4.12	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1417/1553	4.08	4.50	4.69	4.66	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	4	3	3	0	2.90	1471/1536	2.90	3.47	4.07	3.91	2.90

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	1205/1487	4.09	4.38	4.44	4.37	4.09
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1184/1489	3.91	4.22	4.27	4.18	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	3	1	3.27	1361/1481	3.27	3.94	4.28	4.18	3.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	437/1246	4.27	4.18	3.93	3.78	4.27

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	7	2	0	3.00	1269/1411	3.00	3.97	4.00	3.78	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	2	2	4	3.64	1142/1413	3.64	4.36	4.23	3.96	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1075/1408	3.91	4.37	4.27	4.03	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	728/ 856	3.25	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.25

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	91/ 102	3.55	3.55	4.50	3.92	3.55
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	88/ 101	3.73	3.73	4.39	4.03	3.73
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	78/ 90	3.55	3.55	4.36	3.72	3.55
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	77/ 98	4.00	4.00	4.49	3.93	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	6	0	4	1	3.00	83/ 101	3.00	3.00	4.03	3.92	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	7						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: VPA 225 0101
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1551
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	2	3	11	3.77	1284/1556	3.70	3.56	4.25	4.33	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	3	11	4.05	1041/1557	3.93	3.60	4.21	4.30	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1335	****	****	4.24	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	5	3	10	3.86	1143/1510	3.93	3.70	4.19	4.23	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	3	12	4.05	710/1479	3.91	3.91	3.97	3.88	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	10	5	5	3.62	1149/1424	3.76	3.57	4.08	4.04	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	3	12	4.09	941/1537	3.60	3.51	4.15	4.17	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	4.36	1228/1553	4.64	4.50	4.69	4.69	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	2	15	1	3.62	1229/1536	3.66	3.47	4.07	4.13	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	816/1487	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	738/1491	4.87	4.90	4.70	4.75	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	864/1489	4.33	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	6	3	11	3.95	1115/1481	4.16	3.94	4.28	4.37	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	3	2	7	9	3.91	711/1246	4.15	4.18	3.93	4.02	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	451/1411	4.29	3.97	4.00	4.05	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	404/1413	4.60	4.36	4.23	4.28	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	528/1408	4.52	4.37	4.27	4.31	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	3	2	4	9	3.89	497/ 856	4.14	3.92	4.00	3.92	3.89
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	3.55	4.50	3.88	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	3.73	4.39	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	3.55	4.36	3.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	4.49	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	3.00	4.03	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	3.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.31	3.97	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.09	3.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.09	3.93	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	3.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.01	4.07	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.18	3.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.36	4.15	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type		Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: VPA 225 0201
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1552
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1265/1556	3.70	3.56	4.25	4.33	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	1198/1557	3.93	3.60	4.21	4.30	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1335	****	****	4.24	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	984/1510	3.93	3.70	4.19	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	481/1479	3.91	3.91	3.97	3.88	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	738/1424	3.76	3.57	4.08	4.04	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	4	0	4	3.40	1367/1537	3.60	3.51	4.15	4.17	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1056/1553	4.64	4.50	4.69	4.69	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1058/1536	3.66	3.47	4.07	4.13	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	956/1487	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.47	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	513/1491	4.87	4.90	4.70	4.75	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	811/1489	4.33	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	638/1481	4.16	3.94	4.28	4.37	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	337/1246	4.15	4.18	3.93	4.02	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	586/1411	4.29	3.97	4.00	4.05	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	353/1413	4.60	4.36	4.23	4.28	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	584/1408	4.52	4.37	4.27	4.31	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	178/ 856	4.14	3.92	4.00	3.92	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: VPA 225 0301
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1553
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	13	7	6	3.52	1396/1556	3.70	3.56	4.25	4.33	3.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	10	11	7	3.83	1254/1557	3.93	3.60	4.21	4.30	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	23	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	****/1335	****	****	4.24	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	11	10	3.93	1070/1510	3.93	3.70	4.19	4.23	3.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	7	9	6	3.39	1226/1479	3.91	3.91	3.97	3.88	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	8	12	4	3.56	1178/1424	3.76	3.57	4.08	4.04	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	5	6	8	6	3.32	1392/1537	3.60	3.51	4.15	4.17	3.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	272/1553	4.64	4.50	4.69	4.69	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	0	1	7	10	0	3.50	1289/1536	3.66	3.47	4.07	4.13	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	804/1487	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.47	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	563/1491	4.87	4.90	4.70	4.75	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	9	14	4.37	771/1489	4.33	4.22	4.27	4.32	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	5	7	12	4.04	1055/1481	4.16	3.94	4.28	4.37	4.04
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	5	7	13	4.15	534/1246	4.15	4.18	3.93	4.02	4.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	8	13	4.19	637/1411	4.29	3.97	4.00	4.05	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	4	7	15	4.33	730/1413	4.60	4.36	4.23	4.28	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	7	17	4.48	607/1408	4.52	4.37	4.27	4.31	4.48
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	6	9	7	3.91	484/ 856	4.14	3.92	4.00	3.92	3.91
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 244	****	****	4.07	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 236	****	****	4.36	4.53	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 238	****	****	4.26	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 214	****	****	4.08	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 102	****	3.55	4.50	3.88	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 101	****	3.73	4.39	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	3.55	4.36	3.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 98	****	4.00	4.49	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 101	****	3.00	4.03	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	3.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.31	3.97	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.09	3.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.09	3.93	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	3.19	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/	30	****	****	4.01	4.07	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/	32	****	****	4.18	3.92	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/	16	****	****	4.36	4.15	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/	16	****	****	4.51	4.65	****

Course-Section: VPA 225 0301
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1553
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						