Course-Section: DANC 110 0101 Title

BEGIN MOD DANC TECH I

Instructor: LACY, SANDRA L

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 19

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 441 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	11	4.32	769/1481	4.32	4.48	4.29	4.14	4.32
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	560/1481	4.47	4.47	4.23	4.18	4.47
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	278/1249	4.71	4.61	4.27	4.14	4.71
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	7	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	395/1424	4.55	4.11	4.21	4.06	4.55
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	15	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1396	****	4.30	3.98	3.89	****
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	4	2	2	5	0	6	3.40	1166/1342	3.40	3.71	4.07	3.88	3.40
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	5	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1086/1459	3.86	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.86
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	974/1480	4.63	4.58	4.68	4.64	4.63
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	203/1450	4.69	4.36	4.09	3.97	4.69
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	367/1409	4.79	4.54	4.42	4.36	4.79
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.57	5.00
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1399	4.83	4.34	4.26	4.23	4.83
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.19	5.00
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	5	8	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	384/1179	4.33	4.18	3.96	3.85	4.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1262	***	4.39	4.05	3.77	****
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1259	****	4.57	4.29	4.06	****
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1256	****	4.61	4.30	4.08	****
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		15	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.38	4.00	3.80	****
		Self :	Paced															
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.48	****
2. Did st	udy quest	tions make clea:	r the e	xpected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.42	****
3. Were y	our cont	acts with the in	nstruct	or helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.63	****
4. Was th	ne feedba	ck/tutoring by p	proctor	s helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****
5. Were t	here eno	ugh proctors for	r all t	he students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	***	****	4.82	4.58	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Omodita E	Zawnad	Chim CDA		Ermoated Credes				Do	2020				TT+ 1				Mojewa	
Credits E	rarmea	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons				ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В 4							_	•		, .				
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Ge	nera	Τ			1	.0	Under-g	rad 1	L9	Non-	-major	2
84-150												2			,			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ecti	ves				3	#### -	Means t	there a	ire not	enoug	ıh

Other

2

Ρ

I

?

0

Course-Section: DANC 202 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County DANCE HIST II: CONTEMP

Instructor: WALTON, ELIZABE

Enrollment: 27

Questionnaires: 23

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 442

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	_	n this course	0	0	0	0	6	5	12	4.26	831/1481	4.26	4.48	4.29	4.40	4.26
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	4	4	7	8	3.83	1166/1481	3.83	4.47	4.23	4.29	3.83
3. Did	the exam o	questions reflect	t the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	14	4.30	703/1249	4.30	4.61	4.27	4.36	4.30
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	3	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	740/1424	4.25	4.11	4.21	4.28	4.25
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to i	what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	13	4.09	655/1396	4.09	4.30	3.98	3.94	4.09
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	2	1	2	1	5	12	4.19	592/1342	4.19	3.71	4.07	4.05	4.19
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearly	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	0	6	6	11	4.22	809/1459	4.22	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.22
8. How	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.58	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	8	5	6	3.89	981/1450	3.89	4.36	4.09	4.15	3.89
		Lecture	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture:	s well p	prepared	3	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	839/1409	4.45	4.54	4.42	4.47	4.45
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	614/1407	4.85	4.86	4.69	4.78	4.85
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presented	d and ex	xplained clearly	4	0	1	1	2	7	8	4.05	984/1399	4.05	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.05
4. Did	the lectur	es contribute to	o what	you learned	3	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	658/1400	4.45	4.54	4.27	4.34	4.45
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	3	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	259/1179	4.50	4.18	3.96	4.05	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	659/1262	4.13	4.39	4.05	4.11	4.13
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	15	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.57	4.29	4.34	4.00
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage :	fair and	d open discussion	15	0	0	1	1	2	4		848/1256		4.61		4.28	4.13
4. Were	special t	echniques succes	ssful		15	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 788	****	4.38	4.00	3.98	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	ution	ı									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	S	4	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 56-83	0 7	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 1	B 5 C 2		C.	nera:	1				3	Under-q	~~d ^	:3	More	mo i o	1
56-83	-	2.00-2.99	Τ_	C 2		Ger	iera.	Т				3	unaer-g	rau 2	. 3	NOU-	major	4

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	1	С	2	General	3	Under-grad	23	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	_			
				2	2						

University of Maryland Course-Section: DANC 202H 0101 Page 443 Title DANCE HIST II - HONORS Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2006 Instructor: WALTON, ELIZABE

I

0

0

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 1

O L	a	Evaluation	^ 	

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.48	4.29	4.40	5.00
2. Did the	instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.47	4.23	4.29	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.61	4.27	4.36	5.00
4. Did oth	ner evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.11	4.21	4.28	4.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.30	3.98	3.94	4.00
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	755/1342	4.00	3.71	4.07	4.05	4.00
7. Was the	grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.58	4.68	4.68	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.36	4.09	4.15	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.54	4.42	4.47	5.00
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.78	5.00
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.00
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.34	5.00
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.18	3.96	4.05	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Red	 quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			_			-						3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	_f h
P 0													respons					•
													F				-	

Other

1

Course-Section: DANC 216 0101

Title BALLET II (INTERMEDIAT

Instructor: ABEL, CHARLES

Enrollment: 27 Questionnaires: 22

Spring 2006

Page 444 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies

				_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	
Questions	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	1	2	19	4.82	225/1481	4.82	4.48	4.29	4.40	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	176/1481	4.82	4.47	4.23	4.29	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	142/1249	4.91	4.61	4.27	4.36	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	0	1	13	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.11	4.21	4.28	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	363/1396	4.43	4.30	3.98	3.94	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	364/1342	4.44	3.71	4.07	4.05	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	4	5	11	4.24		4.24	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	756/1480	4.86	4.58	4.68	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	159/1450	4.76	4.36	4.09	4.15	4.76
. 3														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	188/1409	4.90	4.54	4.42	4.47	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	431/1399	4.63	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1179	****	4.18	3.96	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	507/1262	4.33	4.39	4.05	4.11	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	1	4		571/1256	4.50	4.61	4.30	4.28	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.38	4.00	3.98	****
nd all a wards														
Field Work	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	****/ 59	****	++++	4 20	1 (7	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21 21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59 ****/ 51	****	****	4.30	4.67 4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.07	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	***	****	4.26	4.69	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.89	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 31			4.42	4.00	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****
,, x ₁ process neighbor		Ū	,	,	3	·	_	2.00	, 51			05	0	

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GP	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	22	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	1	Other	10	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: DANC 260 0101

Title INTRO TO AFRICAN DANCE

Instructor: SNEED, DELPHINE

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 445 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	0	2	13	4.87	188/1481	4.87	4.48	4.29	4.40	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	142/1481	4.87	4.47	4.23	4.29	4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	219/1249	4.79	4.61	4.27	4.36	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	232/1424	4.73	4.11	4.21	4.28	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	233/1396	4.62	4.30	3.98	3.94	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	303/1342	4.50	3.71	4.07	4.05	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	298/1459	4.64	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.58	4.68	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	99/1450	4.90	4.36	4.09	4.15	4.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	150/1409	4.92	4.54	4.42	4.47	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	170/1399	4.86	4.34	4.26	4.29	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	117/1400	4.93	4.54	4.27	4.34	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	94/1179	4.88	4.18	3.96	4.05	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	Λ	9	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.39	4.05	4.11	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	428/1256	4.70	4.61	4.30	4.28	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	492/ 788	3.89	4.38	4.00	3.98	3.89
1. Were special ecominques successful	3	_	_	_	_	-	3	3.05	1527 700	3.05	1.50	1.00	3.70	3.05
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Ĺ	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: DANC 301J 0101 University of Maryland Title INTER/ADV JAZZ WORKSHO Baltimore County

Title INTER/ADV JAZZ WORKSHO Baltimore Count Instructor: KATRINIC, KAREN Spring 2006

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 11

	Evaluation	

Page 446

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eanei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA			3	4	5	Mean			_		Mean	
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1218/1481	3.82	4.48	4.29	4.29	3.82
2. Did	the instru	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	801/1481	4.27	4.47	4.23	4.23	4.27
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	5	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1415/1424	2.50	4.11	4.21	4.27	2.50
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	9	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1396	****	4.30	3.98	4.00	***
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute	to what you learned	0	3	3	2	2	1	0	2.13	1339/1342	2.13	3.71	4.07	4.12	2.13
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearl	y expl	ained	0	0	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1309/1459	3.36	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.36
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1139/1480	4.36	4.58	4.68	4.65	4.36
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	2	0	3	5		3.27	1301/1450	3.27	4.36	4.09	4.10	3.27
		Lectur	e															
1. Wer	e the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1110/1409	4.13	4.54	4.42	4.43	4.13
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	785/1407	4.78	4.86	4.69	4.67	4.78
				explained clearly	3		1	0	3				1210/1399		4.34	4.26	4.27	3.63
		es contribute t			3	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	867/1400	4.25	4.54	4.27	4.28	4.25
				your understanding	3	4	1	1	2	0			1148/1179				4.02	2.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc			what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1262	****	4.39	4.05	4.14	****
				ed to participate	9	-	1	-	0	-			****/1259					****
		_	_	nd open discussion	9		1	0	0				****/1256					****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ty	pe			Majors	.
				-														
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			-			-						3		
FC 02	1	2 00 2 00	^	G 0		a		1				4	TT:===1 === ==		1	37		1

Credits Earned		ned Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate (0 Majo	r	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	4	Under-grad 11	1 Non-	major	1	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means th	here are not	enough		
				P	2			responses to be	e significan	.t		
				I	0	Other	6					
				?	0							

Course-Section: DANC 301T 0101
Title INTERMEDIATE TAP
Instructor: HESS, CAROL A

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 447 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	15	
Questionnaires:	6	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	0	0	6	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.48	4.29	4.29	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.47	4.23	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.61	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1125/1459	3.80	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	797/1480	4.83	4.58	4.68	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	127/1450	4.83	4.36	4.09	4.10	4.83
T a mboose														
Lecture	_						_							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.54	4.42	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.28	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1179	***	4.18	3.96	4.02	****
Discussion														
	-	0	_	0	•	•	-	- 00	***** /1000	ate ate ate ate	4 20	4 05	4 1 4	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1262		4.39	4.05	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1259		4.57	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.61	4.30	4.34	****

Credits E	arned	rned Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: DANC 310 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERM MODERN DANCE I LACY, SANDRA L

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 448

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

					Fr	eque:	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 544		General	=		0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4 72	328/1481	4 72	4.48	4 20	4 20	4 72
		ew insights,skil ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	3 1		4.73			4.48		4.29	4.73 4.27
		estions reflect			0	8	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1249		4.61		4.28	5.00
		ations reflect			0	1	2	1	2	0	5		1275/1424		4.11	4.21	4.27	3.50
			-	what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1			****/1396		4.30	3.98	4.00	****
				what you learned what you learned	-	3	1	2	1	1			1174/1342		3.71	4.07	4.12	3.38
		signments contri system clearly			. 0	1	2	2	0	1			1256/1459		4.00	4.16	4.17	3.50
		was class cance		incu	0	0	0	0	0	8			1200/1480		4.58	4.68	4.65	4.27
				ning effectiveness	-	•	0	0	0	3			196/1450				4.10	
J. 110W WO	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						Ü	Ü	Ü	3	,	1.70	150/1150	1.70	1.50	1.05	1.10	1.70
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	648/1409	4.60	4.54	4.42	4.43	4.60	
2. Did th	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	1	9	4.90	500/1407	4.90	4.86	4.69	4.67	4.90
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	2	2	6	4.40	683/1399	4.40	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.40
4. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	1	1	2	6	4.30	829/1400	4.30	4.54	4.27	4.28	4.30
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	2	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	384/1179	4.33	4.18	3.96	4.02	4.33
		Discuss																
				what you learned	7		0	2	0	0		3.50				4.05		3.50
				d to participate	7	0	1	1		0			1144/1259		4.57			3.25
		_		d open discussion	6	0	0	1		1		4.20	809/1256		4.61	4.30		4.20
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		6	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.38	4.00	4.07	4.00
				_		<u>.</u> ,												
				Freq	uency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	3		
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 7							ed f	or M	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55							-			3								
56-83						Ge:	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	0
84-150																		
Grad.						El	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
	P 0												respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
	I 0					Ot:	her					8						
	? 0																	

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 449

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	8	
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: DANC 316 0101

BALLET III

DOLID, LAURA

Title

Instructor:

			Fre	quer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	3	1	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.48	4.29	4.29	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.47	4.23	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.61	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1396	****	4.30	3.98	4.00	***
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1071/1342	3.60	3.71	4.07	4.12	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.58	4.68	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	630/1450	4.25	4.36	4.09	4.10	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.54	4.42	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.86	4.69	4.67	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.54	4.27	4.28	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	****	4.39	4.05	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1259		4.57	4.29	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1256		4.61	4.30	4.34	****
Frequ			rib	ıtior	1				,					

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

Course-Section: DANC 320 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERM MODERN DANCE II Baltimore County

Instructor: LACY, SANDRA L

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 450

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. Were the instructor's lectures 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1. Did was find the expected goals 1. Did 0. D.
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 3 3 7 4.31 780/1481 4.31 4.48 4.29 4.29 4.31 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 8 4 4.33 736/1481 4.33 4.47 4.23 4.23 4.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 11 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1249 **** 4.61 4.27 4.28 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 1 2 1 2 3 3.44 1288/1424 3.44 4.11 4.21 4.27 3.44 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 11 1 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1396 **** 4.30 3.98 4.00 **** 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 2 1 4 1 3.00 1269/1342 3.00 3.71 4.07 4.12 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 3 1 1 2 3 3 3.60 1228/1459 3.60 4.00 4.16 4.17 3.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 12 1 4.08 1331/1480 4.08 4.58 4.68 4.65 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 10 1 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 8 4 4.33 736/1481 4.33 4.47 4.23 4.23 4.33 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 11 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1249 **** 4.61 4.27 4.28 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 1 2 1 2 3 3.44 1288/1424 3.44 4.11 4.21 4.27 3.44 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 11 1 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1396 **** 4.30 3.98 4.00 **** 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 2 1 4 1 3.00 1269/1342 3.00 3.71 4.07 4.12 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 3 1 1 2 3 3 3.60 1228/1459 3.60 4.00 4.16 4.17 3.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 1 4.08 1331/1480 4.08 4.58 4.68 4.65 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 10 1 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 1 4 5 4.40 891/1409 4.40 4.54 4.42 4.43 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 10 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.86 4.69 4.67 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 4 5 4.27 810/1399 4.27 4.34 4.26 4.27 4.27 4.26 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/1179 **** 4.18 3.96 4.02 ****
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 11 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1249 **** 4.61 4.27 4.28 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 1 2 1 2 3 3.44 1288/1424 3.44 4.11 4.21 4.27 3.44 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 11 1 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1396 **** 4.30 3.98 4.00 **** 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 2 1 4 1 3.00 1269/1342 3.00 3.71 4.07 4.12 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 3 1 1 2 3 3 3.60 1228/1459 3.60 4.00 4.16 4.17 3.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 12 1 4.08 1331/1480 4.08 4.58 4.68 4.65 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 10 1 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 1 1 4 5 4.40 891/1409 4.40 4.54 4.42 4.43 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 10 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.86 4.69 4.67 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 4 5 4.27 810/1399 4.27 4.34 4.26 4.27 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 867/1400 4.25 4.54 4.27 4.28 4.25 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1179 **** 4.18 3.96 4.02 ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 1 2 1 2 3 3.44 1288/1424 3.44 4.11 4.21 4.27 3.44 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 11 1 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1396 **** 4.30 3.98 4.00 **** 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 2 1 4 1 3.00 1269/1342 3.00 3.71 4.07 4.12 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 3 1 1 2 3 3 3.60 1228/1459 3.60 4.00 4.16 4.17 3.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 12 1 4.08 1331/1480 4.08 4.58 4.68 4.65 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 10 1 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 1 1 4 5 4.40 891/1409 4.40 4.54 4.42 4.43 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.86 4.69 4.67 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 4 5 4.27 810/1399 4.27 4.34 4.26 4.27 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 867/1400 4.25 4.54 4.27 4.28 4.25 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 0 0 0 1 5 5.00 ****/1179 **** 4.18 3.96 4.02 ****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 11 1 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/1396 **** 4.30 3.98 4.00 **** 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 2 1 4 1 3.00 1269/1342 3.00 3.71 4.07 4.12 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 3 1 1 2 3 3 3.60 1228/1459 3.60 4.00 4.16 4.17 3.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 12 1 4.08 1331/1480 4.08 4.58 4.68 4.65 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 10 1 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 0 1 4 5 4.40 891/1409 4.40 4.54 4.42 4.43 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 10 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.86 4.69 4.67 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 4 5 4.27 810/1399 4.27 4.34 4.26 4.27 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 867/1400 4.25 4.54 4.27 4.28 4.25 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1179 **** 4.18 3.96 4.02 ****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 2 1 4 1 3.00 1269/1342 3.00 3.71 4.07 4.12 3.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 3 1 1 2 3 3 3.60 1228/1459 3.60 4.00 4.16 4.17 3.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 12 1 4.08 1331/1480 4.08 4.58 4.68 4.65 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 10 1 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 1 4 5 4.40 891/1409 4.40 4.54 4.42 4.43 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.86 4.69 4.67 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 4 5 4.27 810/1399 4.27 4.34 4.26 4.27 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 867/1400 4.25 4.54 4.27 4.28 4.25 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1179 **** 4.18 3.96 4.02 ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 3 1 1 2 3 3 3.60 1228/1459 3.60 4.00 4.16 4.17 3.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 12 1 4.08 1331/1480 4.08 4.58 4.68 4.65 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 10 1 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 1 4 5 4.40 891/1409 4.40 4.54 4.42 4.43 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.86 4.69 4.67 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 4 5 4.27 810/1399 4.27 4.34 4.26 4.27 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 867/1400 4.25 4.54 4.27 4.28 4.25 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1179 **** 4.18 3.96 4.02 ****
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 12 1 4.08 1331/1480 4.08 4.58 4.68 4.65 4.08 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 10 1 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 1 4 5 4.40 891/1409 4.40 4.54 4.42 4.43 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.86 4.69 4.67 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 4 5 4.27 810/1399 4.27 4.34 4.26 4.27 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 867/1400 4.25 4.54 4.27 4.28 4.25 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1179 **** 4.18 3.96 4.02 ****
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 1 4 5 4.40 891/1409 4.40 4.54 4.42 4.43 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 1 1 1 10 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.86 4.69 4.67 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. 1 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 9. 4.30 4.09 4.10 4.09 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. 1 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. 2 0 0 0 0 1 4 5 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. 2 0 0 0 0 1 4 5 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 9. 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 0 0 1 1 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 9. 4.10 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 9. 4.10 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 9. 4.10 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 9. 4.10 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 9. 4.10 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 9. 4.10 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 9. 4.10 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 9. 4.10 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.36 4.09 4.10 4.09 9. 4.10 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.40 4.54 4.42 4.43 4.40 9. 4.10 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.40 4.54 4.40 9. 4.10 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.40 9. 4.10 4.09 786/1450 4.09 4.40 9. 4.10 4.09 4.40 4.54 4.40 9. 4.10 4.09 4
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. 0 0 0 1 1 1 10 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.86 4.69 4.67 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1. 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 5 4.40 891/1409 4.40 4.54 4.42 4.43 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 10 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.86 4.69 4.67 4.75 4. 27 4.27 4.28 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3. 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4 6 4.25 867/1400 4.25 4.54 4.27 4.28 4.25 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 1 4 5 4.40 891/1409 4.40 4.54 4.42 4.43 4.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.86 4.69 4.67 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 4 5 4.27 810/1399 4.27 4.34 4.26 4.27 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 867/1400 4.25 4.54 4.27 4.28 4.25 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1179 **** 4.18 3.96 4.02 ****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 823/1407 4.75 4.86 4.69 4.67 4.75 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 4 5 4.27 810/1399 4.27 4.34 4.26 4.27 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 867/1400 4.25 4.54 4.27 4.28 4.25 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1179 **** 4.18 3.96 4.02 ****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 4 5 4.27 810/1399 4.27 4.34 4.26 4.27 4.27 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 867/1400 4.25 4.54 4.27 4.28 4.25 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1179 **** 4.18 3.96 4.02 ****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 1 4 6 4.25 867/1400 4.25 4.54 4.27 4.28 4.25 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1179 **** 4.18 3.96 4.02 ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1179 **** 4.18 3.96 4.02 ****
Discussion
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/1262 **** 4.39 4.05 4.14 ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 ****/1259 **** 4.57 4.29 4.34 ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 ****/1256 **** 4.61 4.30 4.34 ****
4. Were special techniques successful 10 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 788 **** 4.38 4.00 4.07 ****

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA		Cum. GPA Expected			Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	0	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other	10	_				
				?	1							

Course-Section: DANC 330 0101 University of Maryland DANCE COMPOSITION I

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 451

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Title HAMBY, DOUGLAS Instructor:

Enrollment: 11 Ouestionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eguei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean		Mean	_	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	2 56	1341/1481	3.56	4.48	4.29	4.29	3.56
	0	0	0	1	2	3	2		1253/1481		4.40	4.23	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	Τ	3	3	2		,					3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	Τ.	2	Τ.	0			1193/1249			4.27	4.28	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	959/1424		4.11	4.21	4.27	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	985/1396		4.30	3.98	4.00	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	3.71	4.07	4.12	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1348/1459	3.20	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.58	4.68	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1179/1450	3.63	4.36	4.09	4.10	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1338/1409	3.25	4.54	4.42	4.43	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1257/1407		4.86	4.69	4.67	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	2	0	1		1294/1399		4.34	4.26	4 27	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	0	0	1		1387/1400		4.54	4.27	4.28	2.25
_	5	2	0	0	0	1	_		****/1179				1.20	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	/11/9		4.18	3.96	4.02	
Discussion														

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 4.00 708/1262 4.00 4.39 4.05 4.14 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 0 5 1/1259 5.00 4.57 4.29 4.34 5.00 0 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1256 5.00 4.61 4.30 4.34 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 1 1 1 4.00 394/ 788 4.00 4.38 4.00 4.07 4.00

Credits Ea	arned	rned Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: DANC 350 0101 University of Maryland Page 452
Title DANCE WORKSHOP Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Instructor: WALTON, ELIZABE Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 12

Ouestionnaires:	10	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Sacacioninatics.	10	Deddelle	COULDC	E varaacron	Questionnaire

						Frequencies							ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.29	4.50
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	183/1481	4.80	4.47	4.23	4.23	4.80
		uestions reflec		_	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.61	4.27	4.28	5.00
	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	1	0	1	4	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.11	4.21	4.27	4.33
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1396	****	4.30	3.98	4.00	****
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	3.71	4.07	4.12	4.00
		g system clearl			1	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.00	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.58	4.68	4.65	5.00
				hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	184/1450	4.71	4.36	4.09	4.10	4.71
		Lectur	۵															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	Ο	2	1	4.33	968/1409	4.33	4.54	4.42	4.43	4.33
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 						0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.67	5.00
				xplained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.67
		es contribute t		1	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	421/1400	4.67	4.54	4.27	4.28	4.67
				our understanding	7	1	0	0	1	0	1		****/1179	****	4.18	3.96	4.02	****
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al.	ann dinn			what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.39	4.05	4.14	5.00
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	3		358/1259	4.75	4.57	4.29	4.34	4.75
		-	_	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	3		357/1256	4.75	4.61	4.30	4.34	4.75
		echniques succe		a open arscassion	6	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/ 788	5.00	4.38	4.00	4.07	5.00
				_		<u> </u>	,											
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	tribi	ut 101	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 1						J						5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0										ses to be significant				
				I 0		Otl	her					6						

Course-Section: DANC 416 0101
Title ADVANCED BALLET
Instructor: LACY, SANDRA L
Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 453 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Di	d vou gain m		_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	340/1481	4.71	4.48	4.29	4.45	4.71
					0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.47	4.23	4.32	5.00
			_	_	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.61	4.27	4.44	***
		_		_	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.11	4.21	4.35	4.00
5. Di	d assigned 1	readings contrib	ute to 1	what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1396	****	4.30	3.98	4.09	****
6. Di	d written as	ssignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1318/1342	2.80	3.71	4.07	4.21	2.80
		-		_	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	344/1459	4.60	4.00	4.16	4.25	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled				0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1100/1480	4.43	4.58	4.68	4.74	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes				1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.36	4.09	4.28	4.50	
		T	_															
1 1/10	mo the inst			awanawad	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1 00	224/1400	4 00	1 E1	1 12	4.51	4 00
					2	0	0	0	0	0	4 5	4.80	334/1409 1/1407	4.80 5.00	4.86	4.42 4.69	4.79	4.80 5.00
	Lecture Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject But the lecture material presented and explained cleat Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understant Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Were all students actively encouraged to particing Did the instructor encourage fair and open discus Were special techniques successful Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected (1) Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected (2) Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected (3) Credits Earned Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected (4) Credits Earned Credits Earned Com. GPA Expected (6) Credits Earned Credits Earned Com. GPA Expected (6) Credits Earned Com. GPA Expected (7) Credits Earned Credits Earn			_	2	0	0	0	0	1	5 4	4.80	212/1399	4.80			4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	5		1/1400	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.80
-					2	3	0	0	0	0	2		1/1400	5.00		4.27 3.96	4.38	5.00 5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					2	3	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	1/11/9	5.00	4.18	3.96	4.07	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Di	d class disc	cussions contrib	ute to 1	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	****	4.39	4.05	4.33	****
2. We	re all stude	ents actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1259	****	4.57	4.29	4.57	****
3. Di	d the instru	actor encourage :	fair and	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1256	****	4.61	4.30	4.60	****
4. We	re special t	cechniques succe	ssful		6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 788	****	4.38	4.00	4.26	****
				Freq		. Dia	- wib.	.+ : ^*	_									
				rrequ	lency	DIS	LLID	101	.1									
Credi	ts Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	рe			Majors	\$
00-2	7 1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	aiors	. – – –	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r •	0
28-5	5 0		0	в 3			_									3		
56-8	3 2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	neral	L				2	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	2
				D 0									5				3-	
			2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_j h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I O		Ot1	her					3	-		5			
				? 0														

Course-Section: DANC 420 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV DANCE TECHNIQUE II Baltimore County

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0

Spring 2006

Page 454

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

0 1 5.00 ****/1259 **** 4.57 4.29 4.57 ****

Instructor: HAMBY, DOUGLAS Enrollment: 10

Ouestionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eane	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	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	1	2	3	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.48	4.29	4.45	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1253/1481	3.67	4.47	4.23	4.32	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1160/1424	3.80	4.11	4.21	4.35	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	956/1342	3.80	3.71	4.07	4.21	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.58	4.68	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	722/1450	4.17	4.36	4.09	4.28	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1409	****	4.54	4.42	4.51	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1407	****	4.86	4.69	4.79	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1399	****	4.34	4.26	4.36	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1400	****	4.54	4.27	4.38	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1262	****	4.39	4.05	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1256 **** 4.61 4.30 4.60 ****

0 0

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				2	2						

Course-Section: DANC 475 0101 University of Maryland Page 455 Title Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 SENIOR PROJECTS IN DAN Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WALTON, ELIZABE Spring 2006

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course Dept		ept UMBC Level		Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,skil	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.48	4.29	4.45	5.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.47	4.23	4.32	5.00
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.61	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did ot	d other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.11	4.21	4.35	5.00
5. Did as	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.30	3.98	4.09	5.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contri	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	3.71	4.07	4.21	5.00
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.00	4.16	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.58	4.68	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.36	4.09	4.28	5.00
		Lecture	2															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.54	4.42	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.36	5.00
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.54	4.27	4.38	5.00
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.39	4.05	4.33	5.00
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.57	5.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage i	fair ar	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.61	4.30	4.60	5.00
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succes	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.38	4.00	4.26	5.00
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		~		,				•	1	,	•			0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera.	Τ				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								•			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives							0	#### - Means there are not enough					

Other

2

responses to be significant

0

0

0

I