

Course-Section: VPA 121H 0101
 Title INTRODUCTION TO ARTS I
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1459
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	6	3	5	3.93	1158/1470	3.93	3.84	4.29	4.13	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	2	4	3.57	1288/1470	3.57	3.91	4.23	4.17	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1252	****	4.18	4.27	4.21	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	986/1413	4.00	4.06	4.24	4.12	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	1033/1391	3.67	3.69	4.02	3.96	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	740/1347	4.08	3.91	4.10	4.01	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1369/1455	3.00	4.07	4.16	4.16	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1364/1469	4.08	4.73	4.70	4.65	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	9	1	3.85	1025/1451	3.85	3.67	4.08	3.99	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1161/1407	4.00	4.59	4.43	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	462/1404	4.91	4.82	4.70	4.62	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	1119/1401	3.91	4.33	4.28	4.22	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	753/1398	4.36	4.28	4.27	4.21	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	149/1176	4.70	4.19	3.96	3.84	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	225/1276	4.69	4.39	4.06	3.81	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	416/1277	4.69	4.75	4.30	4.02	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	326/1271	4.77	4.74	4.28	4.02	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	177/ 763	4.50	4.42	4.06	3.92	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 73	****	****	4.59	4.40	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 73	****	****	4.70	4.88	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	****	4.66	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 74	****	****	4.50	4.56	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 71	****	****	4.16	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: VPA 225 0101
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1460
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	5	10	11	9	3.54	1339/1470	3.54	3.84	4.29	4.28	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	13	7	12	3.72	1219/1470	3.72	3.91	4.23	4.22	3.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	804/1252	4.18	4.18	4.27	4.28	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	8	14	11	3.97	1026/1413	3.97	4.06	4.24	4.24	3.97	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	10	9	9	3.42	1175/1391	3.42	3.69	4.02	3.97	3.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	6	12	12	3.78	1014/1347	3.78	3.91	4.10	4.01	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	2	3	11	9	8	3.55	1258/1455	3.55	4.07	4.16	4.20	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	392/1469	4.94	4.73	4.70	4.73	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	5	0	0	10	10	3	3.70	1131/1451	3.70	3.67	4.08	4.04	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	3	8	19	4.38	916/1407	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.41	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	2	3	26	4.69	909/1404	4.69	4.82	4.70	4.71	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	3	10	16	4.29	825/1401	4.29	4.33	4.28	4.26	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	6	11	11	3.90	1098/1398	3.90	4.28	4.27	4.26	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	4	5	19	4.54	235/1176	4.54	4.19	3.96	3.99	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	6	6	10	3.88	827/1276	3.88	4.39	4.06	4.01	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	647/1277	4.44	4.75	4.30	4.25	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	4	18	4.52	553/1271	4.52	4.74	4.28	4.25	4.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	1	5	7	11	4.17	366/ 763	4.17	4.42	4.06	3.98	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 236	****	****	4.22	4.25	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.22	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.33	4.53	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.28	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 214	****	****	4.16	3.95	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 73	****	****	4.59	4.42	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 73	****	****	4.70	4.47	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 64	****	****	4.66	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 74	****	****	4.50	4.28	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 71	****	****	4.16	4.25	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.34	4.50	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.17	4.63	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.48	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.18	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	****	4.48	4.34	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.62	4.78	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	****	4.71	4.88	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 23	****	****	4.66	4.66	****	

Course-Section: VPA 225 0101
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1460
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	37	Non-major	37
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	31				
				?	1						

Course-Section: VPA 325 0101
 Title CONTEMP ART IN PROCESS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1461
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	1	2	1	1	3.40	1385/1470	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.31	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1357/1470	4.08	3.91	4.23	4.22	3.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1252	****	4.18	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	986/1413	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.27	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	623/1347	3.90	3.91	4.10	4.11	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	130/1455	4.60	4.07	4.16	4.12	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1469	4.88	4.73	4.70	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1054/1451	3.60	3.67	4.08	4.07	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	936/1404	4.83	4.82	4.70	4.69	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	780/1401	4.57	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	426/1398	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1176	3.33	4.19	3.96	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	429/1276	4.47	4.39	4.06	4.10	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	292/1277	4.88	4.75	4.30	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	659/1271	4.80	4.74	4.28	4.33	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	177/ 763	4.50	4.42	4.06	4.07	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: VPA 325 0201
 Title CONTEMP ART IN PROCESS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1462
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	1	0	1	4	4.33	771/1470	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.31	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	124/1470	4.08	3.91	4.23	4.22	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1252	****	4.18	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	766/1413	4.13	4.06	4.24	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	736/1391	4.00	3.69	4.02	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	313/1347	3.90	3.91	4.10	4.11	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1455	4.60	4.07	4.16	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	779/1469	4.88	4.73	4.70	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	845/1451	3.60	3.67	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1404	4.83	4.82	4.70	4.69	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	193/1401	4.57	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	894/1398	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.25	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	968/1176	3.33	4.19	3.96	3.97	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1276	4.47	4.39	4.06	4.10	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	268/1277	4.88	4.75	4.30	4.34	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1271	4.80	4.74	4.28	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	177/ 763	4.50	4.42	4.06	4.07	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: VPA 325 0301
 Title CONTEMP ART IN PROCESS
 Instructor: REHM, CINDY J
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1463
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1080/1470	3.91	3.84	4.29	4.31	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1020/1470	4.08	3.91	4.23	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1283/1347	3.90	3.91	4.10	4.11	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1455	4.60	4.07	4.16	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1469	4.88	4.73	4.70	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1374/1451	3.60	3.67	4.08	4.07	3.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	710/1276	4.47	4.39	4.06	4.10	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.88	4.75	4.30	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1271	4.80	4.74	4.28	4.33	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						