

Course Section: VPA 120H 0101
 Title INTRO TO THE ARTS I
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1666
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	0	4	9	14	4.25	914/1669	4.50	4.37	4.23	4.02	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	5	2	11	8	3.85	1280/1666	3.76	4.14	4.19	4.11	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	22	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1421	****	4.50	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	2	8	10	4.29	770/1617	4.02	4.16	4.15	3.99	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	23	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/1555	****	4.30	4.00	3.92	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	2	6	5	9	3.71	1175/1543	3.60	3.96	4.06	3.86	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	13	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	955/1647	3.95	4.07	4.12	4.06	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	641/1668	4.83	4.73	4.67	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	4	14	6	4.08	864/1605	3.67	3.95	4.07	3.96	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	1	4	5	8	3.95	1241/1514	4.22	4.39	4.39	4.32	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	1135/1551	4.29	4.67	4.66	4.55	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	2	0	4	4	9	3.95	1127/1503	3.72	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	4	6	7	3.84	1204/1506	2.92	3.84	4.26	4.17	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	6	1	0	3	1	6	4.00	587/1311	4.00	4.56	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	4	2	8	4.07	824/1490	3.78	4.23	4.05	3.85	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	0	5	8	4.27	873/1502	4.63	4.61	4.26	4.06	4.27	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	596/1489	4.80	4.72	4.29	4.07	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	8	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.19	4.00	3.81	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 28 Non-major 28
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 17		
			I 0	Other 24	
			? 2		

Course Section: VPA 120H 0102
 Title INTRO TO THE ARTS I
 Instructor: KREIZENBECK, AL
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1667
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	4.75	269/1669	4.50	4.37	4.23	4.02	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1387/1666	3.76	4.14	4.19	4.11	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1251/1617	4.02	4.16	4.15	3.99	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1260/1543	3.60	3.96	4.06	3.86	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1275/1647	3.95	4.07	4.12	4.06	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	965/1668	4.83	4.73	4.67	4.62	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1455/1605	3.67	3.95	4.07	3.96	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	799/1514	4.22	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1404/1551	4.29	4.67	4.66	4.55	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1330/1503	3.72	4.15	4.24	4.17	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1490/1506	2.92	3.84	4.26	4.17	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1154/1490	3.78	4.23	4.05	3.85	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1502	4.63	4.61	4.26	4.06	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	4.80	4.72	4.29	4.07	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.19	4.00	3.81	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	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 4 Non-major 4
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 responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course Section: VPA 225 0101
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS
 Instructor: BOAZ, HEATHER
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1668
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	389/1669	4.43	4.37	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1666	4.60	4.14	4.19	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.50	4.24	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	219/1617	4.38	4.16	4.15	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1555	4.45	4.30	4.00	3.96	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	543/1543	4.29	3.96	4.06	4.10	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	583/1647	4.22	4.07	4.12	4.19	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	939/1668	4.49	4.73	4.67	4.59	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	473/1605	4.21	3.95	4.07	4.15	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1514	4.75	4.39	4.39	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.89	4.67	4.66	4.72	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1503	4.65	4.15	4.24	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1506	4.69	3.84	4.26	4.33	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	142/1311	4.63	4.56	3.85	3.96	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1490	4.80	4.23	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	370/1502	4.89	4.61	4.26	4.31	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.72	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	178/1006	4.39	4.19	4.00	3.99	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.74	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 223	****	****	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	****	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: VPA 225 0101
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS
 Instructor: BOAZ, HEATHER
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1668
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: VPA 225 0301
 Title IDEAS IN TH ARTS
 Instructor: MLAD, JACKIE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1669
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	5	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	988/1669	4.43	4.37	4.23	4.34	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	957/1666	4.60	4.14	4.19	4.29	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1421	5.00	4.50	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1029/1617	4.38	4.16	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	939/1555	4.45	4.30	4.00	3.96	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	723/1543	4.29	3.96	4.06	4.10	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1043/1647	4.22	4.07	4.12	4.19	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1418/1668	4.49	4.73	4.67	4.59	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	918/1605	4.21	3.95	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	799/1514	4.75	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.89	4.67	4.66	4.72	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	835/1503	4.65	4.15	4.24	4.29	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	642/1506	4.69	3.84	4.26	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	264/1311	4.63	4.56	3.85	3.96	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	389/1490	4.80	4.23	4.05	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1502	4.89	4.61	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.72	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	453/1006	4.39	4.19	4.00	3.99	4.11	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 2		

Course Section: VPA 225H 0401
 Title
 Instructor: BOAZ, HEATHER
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1670
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.37	4.23	4.34	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.14	4.19	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.50	4.24	4.35	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.16	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.30	4.00	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	895/1543	4.00	3.96	4.06	4.10	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.07	4.12	4.19	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.73	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	918/1605	4.00	3.95	4.07	4.15	4.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.67	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.15	4.24	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	3.84	4.26	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	5.00	4.56	3.85	3.96	5.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1490	4.00	4.23	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1013/1502	4.00	4.61	4.26	4.31	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.72	4.29	4.36	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	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	2	Non-major	2
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						