

Course-Section: LAS 121 01  
 Title Intro to the Arts II  
 Instructor: Hamby,Douglas  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 896  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	1	0	6	0	8	3	3	2.85	1429/1447	2.85	4.52	4.31	4.18	2.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	7	5	2	0	2.15	1443/1447	2.15	4.52	4.27	4.30	2.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1241	****	4.62	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	7	5	5	2	0	2.11	1398/1402	2.11	4.46	4.24	4.15	2.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	17	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1358	****	4.49	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	7	6	3	2	0	2.00	1310/1316	2.00	4.25	4.14	3.99	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	11	5	3	0	0	1.58	1424/1427	1.58	4.18	4.19	4.24	1.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.75	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	8	5	1	0	2.17	1420/1434	2.17	4.40	4.10	4.10	2.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	3	2	5	4	1	2.87	1359/1387	2.87	4.59	4.46	4.46	2.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	2	4	1	2	6	3.40	1369/1387	3.40	4.88	4.73	4.71	3.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	5	2	6	0	1	2.29	1375/1386	2.29	4.52	4.32	4.32	2.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	8	4	2	1	0	1.73	1378/1380	1.73	4.50	4.32	4.31	1.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	3	2	2	0	1	2.25	1172/1193	2.25	4.10	4.02	3.99	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	7	2	4	1	2.59	1156/1172	2.59	4.37	4.15	3.95	2.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	0	4	4	5	3.35	1111/1182	3.35	4.61	4.35	4.18	3.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	4	8	1	2	2.82	1149/1170	2.82	4.63	4.38	4.17	2.82
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	2	3	2	4	1	2.92	760/ 800	2.92	4.47	4.06	3.95	2.92
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 66	****	2.00	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 62	****	3.00	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	2.00	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	****/ 65	****	1.00	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 64	****	2.00	4.09	3.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 6		