

Course-Section: VPA 225 1
 Title Ideas In The Arts
 Instructor: Boaz,Heather M
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1450
 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	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	496/1447	4.59	4.24	4.31	4.31	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	179/1447	4.82	4.19	4.27	4.23	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.75	4.33	4.35	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	150/1402	4.82	4.30	4.24	4.24	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	672/1358	4.19	3.93	4.11	4.12	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	681/1316	4.19	4.09	4.14	4.08	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	361/1427	4.59	4.07	4.19	4.14	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	12	4	4.06	1346/1447	4.06	4.53	4.69	4.70	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	956/1434	3.93	3.96	4.10	3.97	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	160/1387	4.92	4.76	4.46	4.42	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.90	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	206/1386	4.85	4.62	4.32	4.24	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	326/1380	4.77	4.68	4.32	4.30	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	86/1193	4.85	4.72	4.02	4.04	4.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.80	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.70	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	327/1170	4.80	4.90	4.38	4.32	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 800	****	4.25	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 17	Non-major 17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: VPA 325 1
 Title Contemp Art In Process
 Instructor: Flanigan, Meghan
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1451
 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	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1174/1447	3.89	4.24	4.31	4.32	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1304/1447	3.56	4.19	4.27	4.23	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1241	****	4.75	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1153/1402	3.78	4.30	4.24	4.24	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1084/1358	3.67	3.93	4.11	4.10	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.09	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1243/1427	3.56	4.07	4.19	4.15	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.53	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	849/1434	4.00	3.96	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	656/1387	4.60	4.76	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	784/1387	4.80	4.90	4.73	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	748/1386	4.40	4.62	4.32	4.30	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	549/1380	4.60	4.68	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	224/1193	4.60	4.72	4.02	4.05	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	323/1172	4.60	4.80	4.15	4.24	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	638/1182	4.40	4.70	4.35	4.42	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.90	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	335/ 800	4.25	4.25	4.06	4.12	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 9	Non-major 9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	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 1		
				? 1			