Course-Section: MUSC 100 0101 University of Maryland Page 1125
Title INTRO TO MUSIC Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: GENDELMAN, MART Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Enrollment:	110
Questionnaires:	41

		1					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	1	0	7	3	13	7	10	3.25	1565/1639	3.25	4.66	4.27	4.08	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	3	12	7	12	3.40	1522/1639	3.40	4.62	4.22	4.17	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	0	9	11	15	3.78	1165/1397	3.78	4.72	4.28	4.18	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	2	1	6	3	4	3.38	1455/1583	3.38	4.67	4.19	4.01	3.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	9	3	4	14	9	3.28	1350/1532	3.28	4.40	4.01	3.88	3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	29	0	2	1	7	1	3.64	1135/1504	3.64	4.23	4.05	3.78	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	4	2	9	12	13	3.70	1305/1612	3.70	4.36	4.16	4.10	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	11	27	4.64	1023/1635	4.64	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	7	13	8	3	3.16	1450/1579	3.16	4.55	4.08	3.95	3.16
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	_	1	12	15	2 07	1331/1518	3.87	4.70	4.43	4.38	3.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	3	7	25		1230/1520		4.85	4.70	4.61	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	2	12	12	9		1343/1517		4.65	4.27	4.20	3.51
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	7	4	5	9	13		1352/1550		4.60	4.22	4.17	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	4	1	7	9	12		938/1295		4.45	3.94	3.84	
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	-1	-	,	9	12	3.30	930/1293	3.30	4.45	3.94	3.04	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	4	1	3	3	1	2.67	1342/1398	2.67	4.25	4.07	3.85	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1146/1391	3.75	4.36	4.30	4.07	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1162/1388	3.58	4.42	4.28	4.01	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	28	9	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.71	****
Posses														

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	 А	12	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	16						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	14	Under-grad	41	Non-major	41
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0101 University of Maryland Title

FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE

Enrollment: 75 Questionnaires: 75

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1126 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

						<u>-</u>					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1. Did y	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	ills fr	om this course	51	0	2	2	2	6	12	4.00	1138/1639	3.86	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.00
2. Did t	he instruc	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	51	0	1	0	4	3	16	4.38	722/1639	4.44	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.38
3. Did ti	he exam qu	uestions reflec	ct the	expected goals	51	0	0	1	2	4	17	4.54	477/1397	4.60	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.54
4. Did o	ther evalu	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	51	7	5	0	3	1	8	3.41	****/1583	3.82	4.67	4.19	4.01	***
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	51	4	1	0	4	6	9	4.10	700/1532	4.10	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.10
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contr	ribute	to what you learned	51	4	7	2	6	2	3	2.60	1474/1504	2.60	4.23	4.05	3.78	2.60
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearl	ly expl	ained	51	0	0	3	1	3	17	4.42	617/1612	4.48	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.42
8. How m	any times	was class cand	celled		51	1	0	0	0	18	5	4.22	1382/1635	4.54	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.22
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	all tea	ching effectiveness	54	0	1	2	4	11	3	3.62	1263/1579	3.89	4.55	4.08	3.95	3.62
	Lecture																	
1. Were	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	2	5	0	17	4.33	1021/1518	4.38	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.33
	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	1213/1520	4.60	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.48
3. Was 1	ecture mat	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	51	0	1	3	2	5	13	4.08	1036/1517	4.25	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.08
4. Did ti	he lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	51	1	1	2	4	3	13	4.09	1038/1550	4.06	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.09
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques er	nhance	your understanding	52	15	3	0	1	1	3	3.13	****/1295	3.82	4.45	3.94	3.84	****
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did c	lass discu	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	67	0	3	0	1	2	2	3.00	****/1398	3.35	4.25	4.07	3.85	***
2. Were	all studer	nts actively en	ncourag	ed to participate	67	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	****/1391	3.88	4.36	4.30	4.07	****
3. Did ti	he instruc	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	67	0	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	****/1388	3.76	4.42	4.28	4.01	****
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	essful	-	67	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 958	***	4.18	3.93	3.71	****
		Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Do:	ason	ı.c			Ту	ne			Majors	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades												ту.	 Þe				, 	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 13						.3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0	
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В 9		_		_				_	1					
E6 02	2	2 00 2 00	- 7	C 1		C 0.	nora	1				E	IIndor-a		7 =		maiar	75

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General 5		Under-grad	75	Non-major	75
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0201

Title FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR

Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS

Enrollment: 79
Questionnaires: 77

Fall 2007

Page 1127 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Ouestions						_	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights, skills fro	om this course	4	0	6	6	17	18	26	3.71	1384/1639	3.86	4.66	4.27	4.08	3.71
2. Did th	he instruc	tor make clear the ex	spected goals	5	0	1	0	6	20	45	4.50	517/1639	4.44	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.50
3. Did th	he exam qu	estions reflect the e	expected goals	5	0	0	2	5	8	57	4.67	367/1397	4.60	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.67
4. Did of	ther evalu	ations reflect the ex	spected goals	4	51	1	3	4	5	9	3.82	1219/1583	3.82	4.67	4.19	4.01	3.82
	_	adings contribute to	-	4	9	3	3	10	16	32	4.11	700/1532	4.10	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.11
		ignments contribute t	_	5	59	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	****/1504	2.60	4.23	4.05	3.78	****
		system clearly expla	ined	5	1	0	4	5	10	52	4.55	449/1612		4.36	4.16	4.10	4.55
	-	was class cancelled		5	2	0	0	2	6		4.86	736/1635		4.54	4.65		4.86
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	14	1	0	2	10	26	24	4.16	760/1579	3.89	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.16
		Lecture															
1. Were t	the instru	ctor's lectures well	prepared	6	0	0	2	8	19	42	4.42	919/1518	4.38	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.42
2. Did th	he instruc	tor seem interested i	n the subject	7	0	0	0	5	9	56	4.73	943/1520	4.60	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.73
3. Was le	ecture mat	erial presented and e	explained clearly	9	0	1	1	7	19	40	4.41	713/1517	4.25	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.41
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				6	5	3	11	11	34	4.03	1062/1550	4.06	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.03
5. Did a	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				25	4	2	12	6	20	3.82	798/1295	3.82	4.45	3.94	3.84	3.82
	Discussion																
1 544							4	8	4	12	2 25	1177/1398	2 25	4 25	4 07	3.85	3.35
	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learne . Were all students actively encouraged to participat					6 3	2	8	4	17		1076/1391		4.25	4.07	4.07	3.88
		tor encourage fair ar		43 44	0	1	3	12	4	13		1076/1391		4.42	4.28	4.07	3.76
		chniques successful	d open discussion	44	22	4	1	2	0	4		****/ 958		4.18	3.93	3.71	****
1. WCIC .	врестат се	ciniiques successiui			22	-	_	2	O	-	2.71	, 550		1.10	3.75	3.71	
		Laboratory															
2. Were	you provid	ed with adequate back	ground information	76	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	****
		Seminar															
1 Were	aggianed t	opics relevant to the	announced theme	76	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
		tor available for inc		76	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 82		****		4.12	****
Z. Was ci	iic iiibei ac	cor avariable for the	arviduar accention	70	O	Ü	U	_	Ü	O	3.00	, 02			1.52	1.12	
		Field Work															
3. Was th	he instruc	tor available for cor	sultation	76	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	4.83	4.75	4.79	****
	Fre							n									
		_	_														
Credits I	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe 			Majors	; 		
00-27	00-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 57					quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s 5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55						_			-						_		
56-83						nera:	1			1	9	Under-g	rad [77	Non-	major	77
84-150 14 3.00-3.49 18 D 1																	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 19 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	ŗh
P 1											_	respons	es to b	oe sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0 ? 1						ner					1						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0101 Title

MUSICIANSHIP LAB I

Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 19 Fall 2007

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1128 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	q		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	2	4	7	6	3.89	1259/1639	4.09	4.66	4.27	4.08	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	617/1639	4.57	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	767/1397	4.56	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	832/1583	4.46	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1532	4.50	4.40	4.01	3.88	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	964/1504	4.07	4.23	4.05	3.78	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	767/1612	4.40	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1366/1635	4.44	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	691/1579	4.11	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	877/1518	4.61	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1074/1520	4.73	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	335/1517	4.76	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	522/1550	4.72	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	5	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	265/1295	4.59	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/1398	4.13	4.25	4.07	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1391	4.75	4.36	4.30	4.07	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	2		****/1388	4.38	4.42	4.28	4.01	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	1	0	1	1		****/ 958			3.93	3.71	***
- 1														
Laboratory	1.0	•	•	-	•	•	0	0 00	****	als als als als	1 00	4 11	4 01	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,		****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	,	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	4.83	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0101 University of Maryland MUSICIANSHIP LAB I

Title Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW (Instr. A) Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1128

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0101

Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB I Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 19

Fall 2007

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1129 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		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	2	4	7	6		1259/1639		4.66	4.27	4.08	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	. ,		4.62	4.22	4.17	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	767/1397		4.72	4.28	4.18	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	,		4.67	4.19	4.01	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1532	4.50	4.40	4.01	3.88	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	964/1504	4.07	4.23	4.05	3.78	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	767/1612	4.40	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1366/1635	4.44	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	795/1579	4.11	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	782/1518	4.61	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.49
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	750/1520	4.73	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	287/1517	4.76	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82			4.60	4.22	4.17	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	13		129/1295		4.45		3.84	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	2	3 50	****/1398	4.13	4.25	4.07	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	1	2		****/1391	4.75	4.36	4.30	4.07	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	2		****/1388	4.73		4.28	4.07	****
-	15	1	0	1	0	1			****/ 958		4.42			****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	U	Т	U	1	Т	3.07	****/ 958	4.67	4.18	3.93	3.71	
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	***	****	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	10	U	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	/ 02			4.10	3.90	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	4.83	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	***	4.33	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	, -	****	4.69	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****
1 seed and products for all one seadenes		Ü	ŭ	-	Ü	J	J	2.00	, 21		3.00	1.02	2.00	

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0101
Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB I

MUSICIANSHIP LAB I Ba KIMBOYLE, DAVID (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 19

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1129 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 MUSICIANSHIP LAB I Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1130

	Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General														
1		0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.29	860/1639	4.09	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.29
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	-	-	0	0	Τ	2	2		,					
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	295/1639	4.57	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.71
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	209/1397	4.56	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.83
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	371/1583	4.46	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.60
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1532	4.50	4.40	4.01	3.88	***
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	824/1504	4.07	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.00
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	166/1612	4.40	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.80
	How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1235/1635	4.44	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.40
	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	725/1579	4.11	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.40
٠.	now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	_	Ü	O	Ü	_	_	-	1.20	72371373	1.11	1.55	1.00	3.75	1.10
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1518	4.61	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.93
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	4.73	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.93
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	4.76	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.93
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	٥	0	0	6	5.00	1/1550	4.72	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.93
		1	0	1	0	1	0	4		-,					
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Τ	0	1	U	Τ	U	4	4.00	623/1295	4.59	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.43

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 MUSICIANSHIP LAB I Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1131

			Fre	equer	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	1	3	3	4.29	860/1639	4.09	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	295/1639	4.57	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	209/1397	4.56	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	371/1583	4.46	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1532	4.50	4.40	4.01	3.88	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	824/1504	4.07	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	166/1612	4.40	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1235/1635	4.44	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1579	4.11	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1518	4.61	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.73	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1517	4.76	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	4.72	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	95/1295	4.59	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.43

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0301 University of Maryland Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB I

Baltimore County

Instructor: LAMON-ANDERSON Fall 2007

Enrollment: 9 Ouestionnaires: 13

Grad.

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1132 FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 1 2 4 5 4.08 1082/1639 4.09 4.66 4.27 4.08 4.08 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 6 7 4.54 486/1639 4.57 4.62 4.22 4.17 4.54 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 4 8 4.54 487/1397 4.56 4.72 4.28 4.18 4.54 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 323/1583 4.46 4.67 4.19 4.01 4.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 4 7 4.50 335/1532 4.50 4.40 4.01 3.88 4.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 8 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 291/1504 4.07 4.23 4.05 3.78 4.60 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 2 0 1 4 5 3.83 1229/1612 4.40 4.36 4.10 4.10 3.83 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 1 10 <math>4.91 662/1635 4.44 4.54 4.65 4.56 4.919. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 1 1 0 6 0 3.38 1375/1579 4.11 4.55 4.08 3.95 3.38 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 1 0 0 3 5 4.22 1118/1518 4.61 4.70 4.43 4.38 4.22 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 1318/1520 4.73 4.85 4.70 4.61 4.33 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 674/1517 4.76 4.65 4.27 4.20 4.44 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 832/1550 4.72 4.60 4.22 4.17 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 3 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 100/1295 4.59 4.45 3.94 3.84 4.83 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 1 0 1 1 5 4.13 721/1398 4.13 4.25 4.07 3.85 4.13 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 393/1391 4.75 4.36 4.30 4.07 4.75 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 1 0 0 1 6 4.38 758/1388 4.38 4.42 4.28 4.01 4.38 4. Were special techniques successful 5 2 0 0 1 0 5 4.67 155/ 958 4.67 4.18 3.93 3.71 4.67 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 12 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 3.90 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 12 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 **** 240 **** 1.00 4.11 4.01 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 12 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 219 **** **** 4.44 4.44 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 215 **** 4.35 4.43 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 12 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 198 **** **** 4.18 4.25 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 52 **** 3.50 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 53 **** 3.50 4.05 3.51 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.78 4.45 4.54 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 00-27 Major в 1 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 C 0 56-83 2.00-2.99 0 General 0 Under-grad 13 Non-major 11 1 0 3.00-3.49 1 0 3.50-4.00 1 D 0 84-150

Electives 0

Other

F 0

P 0

T 0

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0301 University of Maryland Page 1133
Title MUSIC REPERTOIRE Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1				
Questionnaires:	1	Studen	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Frequencies				Instructor		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	0	1	5.00	1/1639	4.64	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	4.54	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	4.63	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	4.64	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.85	4.23	4.05	3.78	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	4.64	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	4.62	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0601 University of Maryland Page 1134
Title MUSIC REPERTOIRE Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questionnaires: 14

	Frequencies							Instructor		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	4	2	8	4.29	860/1639	4.64	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1036/1639	4.54	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	795/1397	4.63	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	771/1583	4.64	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	222/1504	4.85	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	6	2	3	3.73	1294/1612	4.36	4.36	4.16	4.10	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1326/1635	4.64	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	680/1579	4.62	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1162/1518	4.17	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	2	4		1033/1520	4.67	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	973/1517	4.17	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	832/1550	4.33	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	929/1295	3.60	4.45	3.94	3.84	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	Ω	Λ	Λ	3	3	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	3	2		1065/1388	3.83	4.42	4.28	4.01	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	g g	2	0	0	n	1	2	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	4.18	3.93	3.71	4.75
1. Mere apecial eccinityaes adecessial	O	2	5	J	U	1	,	1.75	110/ 000	1.75	1.10	5.95	J. / I	1.75

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 113 0101 University of Maryland Title ITALIAN FOR MUSICIANS Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1135

Fall 2007 Instructor: MASTRIAN, STACE

Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires:	2	Student	Course	Fwaluation	Questionnaire
Questionnaires.	2	Student	Course	Evaluation	Quescionnaire

			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	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1212/1504	3.50	4.23	4.05	3.78	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1576/1612	2.50	4.36	4.16	4.10	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1618/1635	3.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 125 0101 University of Maryland Title THEORY I:BASICS OF MUS

Baltimore County Fall 2007

SMITH, STUART S Instructor: Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 14

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 1136

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	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	1	0	0	0	1	2	1.0	4.69	391/1639	4.56	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	435/1639	4.45	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	202/1397	4.52	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7		4.31	741/1583	4.22	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	5	1	4.00	774/1532		4.40	4.01	3.88	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	2	2	4		1092/1504		4.23	4.05	3.78	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	207/1612		4.36	4.16	4.10	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	5		1225/1635	4.63	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	302/1579	4.10	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.58
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	U	_	J	O	1.50	302/13/9	4.10	1.33	1.00	3.93	1.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	670/1518	4.34	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	560/1517	4.14	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	338/1550	4.44	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	623/1295	4.17	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	539/1398	4.23	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	655/1391	4.56	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	4.54	4.42	4.28	4.01	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	935/ 958	2.96	4.18	3.93	3.71	2.17
<u>.</u>														
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	atio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	Α	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 125 0201

Title THEORY I:BASICS OF MUS

Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1137 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Quanti an a			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
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. 0 0 0 0 1 2 15 4.88 175/1307 4.52 4.72 4.28 4.18 4.88 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4. 0 0 0 0 0 2 15 4.88 175/1307 4.52 4.67 4.29 4.18 4.88 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4. 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1.0 4.88 175/1307 4.52 4.67 4.29 4.18 4.88 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4. 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1.0 4.88 175/1307 4.52 4.67 4.19 4.01 4.18 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5. 0 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 223/1532 4.11 4.40 4.01 3.88 4.69 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5. 0 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 218/1612 4.01 4.36 4.16 4.10 4.75 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 5. 0 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 218/1612 4.01 4.36 4.16 4.10 4.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did written assignment expected in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding o	Questions	NR	NA		_		4	5	Mean	Rank		_			Mean
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. 0 0 0 0 1 2 15 4.88 175/1307 4.52 4.72 4.28 4.18 4.88 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4. 0 0 0 0 0 2 15 4.88 175/1307 4.52 4.67 4.29 4.18 4.88 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4. 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1.0 4.88 175/1307 4.52 4.67 4.29 4.18 4.88 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4. 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1.0 4.88 175/1307 4.52 4.67 4.19 4.01 4.18 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5. 0 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 223/1532 4.11 4.40 4.01 3.88 4.69 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 5. 0 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 218/1612 4.01 4.36 4.16 4.10 4.75 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 5. 0 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 218/1612 4.01 4.36 4.16 4.10 4.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did written assignment expected in the subject 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 9. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 9. Did the lab increase understanding o															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		4	Λ	Λ	Λ	1	1	15	4 82	230/1630	4 56	4 66	4 27	4 08	4 82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals			-	-	-	_	2			,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals				-	-	_	2			,					
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 1 3 12 4.69 23/1532 4.11 4.40 4.01 3.88 4.69 6. Did written assigned to contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.75 128/1612 4.01 4.36 4.16 4.10 4.75 8. How many times was clearly explained 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 128/1612 4.01 4.36 4.16 4.10 4.75 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 205/1579 4.10 4.55 4.08 3.95 4.71 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 0 0 1/1518 4.34 4.70 4.43 4.38 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 0 0 1/1518 4.34 4.70 4.43 4.38 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.94 382/1520 4.89 4.85 4.70 4.61 4.94 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.94 382/1520 4.49 4.65 4.27 4.20 4.88 4.01 4.01 4.05 4.27 4.20 4.88 4.01 4.01 4.05 4.27 4.20 4.89 4.01 4.01 4.05 4.27 4.20 4.89 4.01 4.01 4.05 4.27 4.20 4.89 4.01 4.01 4.05 4.27 4.20 4.89 4.01 4.01 4.05 4.27 4.20 4.89 4.01 4.01 4.05 4.27 4.20 4.89 4.01 4.01 4.05 4.27 4.20 4.89 4.01 4.01 4.05 4.27 4.20 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.0							2			-,					
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 5 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 218/1612 4.01 4.36 4.16 4.10 4.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.75 218/1612 4.01 4.36 4.16 4.10 4.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.75 218/1612 4.01 4.36 4.16 4.10 4.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.75 218/1612 4.01 4.55 4.68 4.56 4.56 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 2 10 4.71 205/1579 4.10 4.55 4.08 3.95 4.71 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.94 382/1520 4.89 4.85 4.70 4.43 4.38 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.94 382/1520 4.89 4.85 4.70 4.61 4.94 4.10 1 4.55 4.7 4.20 4.88 181/1517 4.14 4.55 4.27 4.20 4.88 4.10 1 4.55 4.10 4.55 4.10 4.55 4.10 4.55 4.10 4.10 4.55 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10	1 3				-		3								
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 5 0 0 0 0 4 12 4.75 218/1612 4.01 4.36 4.16 4.10 4.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 5 0 0 0 0 7 9 94.56 1094/1635 4.63 4.54 4.65 4.56 4.56 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 205/1579 4.10 4.55 4.08 3.95 4.71 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 0 0 1 15 5.00 1/1518 4.34 4.70 4.43 4.38 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 382/1520 4.89 4.85 4.70 4.61 4.94 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 382/1520 4.89 4.85 4.70 4.61 4.94 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 122/1550 4.44 4.60 4.22 4.17 4.95 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 2 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 129/1295 4.17 4.45 3.94 3.84 4.77 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 441/1391 4.56 4.36 4.30 4.07 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 441/1391 4.56 4.36 4.30 4.07 4.71 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 2 0 0 1 0 3.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 3.93 **** 4.84 4.84 4.84 4.84 4.84 4.84 4.84					-										
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 2 1 4.71 205/1579 4.10 4.55 4.08 3.95 4.71 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.94 382/1520 4.89 4.85 4.70 4.61 4.94 2.00 1 1 1 5 4.94 382/1520 4.89 4.85 4.70 4.61 4.94 3.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0				-	-	-									
Discussion Dis			0	0	0	0	7								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 5.00 1/1518 4.34 4.70 4.43 4.38 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 382/1520 4.89 4.85 4.70 4.61 4.94 4.01 4.01 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02			0	0	0	1	2	11						3.95	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 5.00 1/1518 4.34 4.70 4.43 4.38 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 382/1520 4.89 4.85 4.70 4.61 4.94 4.01 4.01 4.02 4.02 4.01 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02 4.02	T a shows														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 382/1520 4.89 4.85 4.70 4.61 4.94 3 was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 0 0 0 2 14 4.88 181/1517 4.14 4.65 4.27 4.20 4.88 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 122/1550 4.44 4.60 4.22 4.17 4.94 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 2 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 129/1295 4.17 4.45 3.94 3.84 4.77 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 386/1398 4.23 4.25 4.07 3.85 4.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 441/1391 4.56 4.36 4.30 4.07 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 593/1388 4.54 4.42 4.28 4.01 4.57 4. Were special techniques successful 7 6 0 0 3 4 1 3.75 610/958 2.96 4.18 3.93 3.71 3.75 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 24 **** **** 4.10 3.90 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 24 **** 4.35 4.43 **** 5.00 4.58 4.59 **** 5.00 4.58 4.59 **** 5.00 4.58 4.59 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 **** 5		5	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	16	5 00	1/1510	4 34	4 70	4 43	4 30	5 00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5 0 0 0 0 0 2 14 4.88 181/1517 4.14 4.65 4.27 4.20 4.88 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 122/1550 4.44 4.60 4.22 4.17 4.94 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 2 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 129/1295 4.17 4.45 3.94 3.84 4.77 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 386/1398 4.23 4.25 4.07 3.85 4.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 441/1391 4.56 4.36 4.30 4.07 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 441/1391 4.56 4.36 4.30 4.07 4.71 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.0			-				-			,					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 1 15 4.94 122/1550 4.44 4.60 4.22 4.17 4.94 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 2 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 129/1295 4.17 4.45 3.94 3.84 4.77 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 386/1398 4.23 4.25 4.07 3.85 4.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 441/1391 4.56 4.36 4.30 4.07 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 593/1388 4.54 4.42 4.28 4.01 4.57 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.0						-	2								
Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 386/1398 4.23 4.25 4.07 3.85 4.57 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 441/1391 4.56 4.36 4.30 4.07 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.71 4.7							1			- , -					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 386/1398 4.23 4.25 4.07 3.85 4.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 441/1391 4.56 4.36 4.30 4.07 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 593/1388 4.54 4.42 4.28 4.01 4.57 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 386/1398 4.23 4.25 4.07 3.85 4.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 441/1391 4.56 4.36 4.30 4.07 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 593/1388 4.54 4.42 4.28 4.01 4.57 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 2 11 4.71 441/1391 4.56 4.36 4.30 4.07 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 593/1388 4.54 4.42 4.28 4.01 4.57 4.57 4.57 4.593/1388 4.54 4.42 4.28 4.01 4.57 4.57 4.593/1388 4.54 4.42 4.28 4.01 4.57 4.57 4.593/1388 4.54 4.42 4.28 4.01 4.57 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 1 4 9 4.57 593/1388 4.54 4.42 4.28 4.01 4.57 4. Were special techniques successful 7 6 0 0 3 4 1 3.75 610/958 2.96 4.18 3.93 3.71 3.75 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 2 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 224 **** **** 4.10 3.90 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 ****/ 240 **** 1.00 4.11 4.01 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.35 4.43 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 52 **** 3.50 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 53 **** 3.50 4.05 3.51 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 50 **** 4.78 4.45 4.54 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.69 4.69 **** 3.50 **** 4.69 4.69 ****		7				1	4	9						3.85	
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3. Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 3. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Did self-paced 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. A 1 3.75 610/958 2.96 4.18 3.93 3.71 3.75 4. Di 3. 3. 5 610/958 2.96 4.18 3.93 3.71 3.75 4. Di 3. 3. 5 610/958 2.96 4.18 3.93 3.71 3.75 4. Di 3. 3. 5 610/958 2.96 4.18 3.93 3.71 3.75 4. Di 3. 3. 5 610/958 2.96 4.18 3.93 3.71 3.75 4. Di 3. 3. 5 610/958 2.96 4.18 3.93 3.71 3.75 4. Di 3. 3. 5 610/958 2.96 4.18 3.93 3.71 3.75 4. Di 3. 3. 5 610/958 2.96 4.18 3.93 3.71 3.75 4. Di 3. 3. 6 10/958 2.96 4.18 3.93 3.71 3.75 4. Di 4. Di 5.							2							4.07	
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 2 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** / 224 **** **** 4.10 3.90 **** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 **** / 240 **** 1.00 4.11 4.01 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 215 **** **** 4.35 4.43 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** / 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 **** / 52 **** 3.50 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 **** / 53 **** 3.50 4.05 3.51 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 **** / 50 **** 4.78 4.45 4.54 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** / 32 **** 4.40 4.51 4.67 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 **** / 43 **** 4.69 4.69 4.69 ****							4	9							
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18	4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	610/ 958	2.96	4.18	3.93	3.71	3.75
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18	Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 **** 240 **** 1.00 4.11 4.01 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 215 *** *** 4.35 4.43 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 **** 85 *** 5.00 4.58 4.50 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 **** 52 *** 3.50 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 **** 53 *** 3.50 4.05 3.51 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 **** 50 *** 4.78 4.45 4.54 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 32 *** 4.40 4.51 4.67 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 **** 4.38 **** 4.69 4.69 4.69 ****		18	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 215 **** **** 4.35 4.43 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 85 **** 5.00 4.58 4.50 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 52 **** 3.50 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 53 **** 3.50 4.05 3.51 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 50 **** 4.78 4.45 4.54 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.40 4.51 4.67 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 1 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.69 4.69 ****	5				-	_	-	-		,	****	1.00		4.01	***
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 52 **** 3.50 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 53 **** 3.50 4.05 3.51 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 50 **** 4.78 4.45 4.54 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.40 4.51 4.67 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 1 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.69 ****										,	****				****
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 52 **** 3.50 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 53 **** 3.50 4.05 3.51 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 50 **** 4.78 4.45 4.54 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.40 4.51 4.67 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 1 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.69 ****															
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 52 **** 3.50 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 53 **** 3.50 4.05 3.51 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 50 **** 4.78 4.45 4.54 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.40 4.51 4.67 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.69 ****			_		_		_	_							
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 52 **** 3.50 4.04 3.61 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 53 **** 3.50 4.05 3.51 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 50 **** 4.78 4.45 4.54 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.40 4.51 4.67 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 1 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.69 ****	1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18 0 1 0 2 0 0 2.33 ****/ 53 **** 3.50 4.05 3.51 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 50 **** 4.78 4.45 4.54 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.40 4.51 4.67 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 1 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.69 ****	Field Work														
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 50 **** 4.78 4.45 4.54 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.40 4.51 4.67 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 1 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.69 4.69 ****	1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	3.61	***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 50 **** 4.78 4.45 4.54 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.40 4.51 4.67 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 1 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.69 ****	2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	3.51	***
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 2 1 0 3.33 ****/ 50 **** 4.78 4.45 4.54 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.40 4.51 4.67 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 1 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.69 ****	Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 18 2 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 32 **** 4.40 4.51 4.67 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 1 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.69 ****		18	0	0	0	2	1	0	3 . 33	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 18 1 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.69 ****								-		,	****				****
								-		, -					****
	-							-		,					****
From the property of the state				-	-	-	_	-		, 32			'	/	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 125 0301 University of Maryland Title THEORY I:BASICS OF MUS Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 13

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1138

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	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	0	0	-1	1	_	_	4 17	000/1620	4 50	1	4 07	4 00	4 1 7
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	J.	5	5	4.17	990/1639		4.66	4.27	4.08	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	3	5		1090/1639	4.45	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	Τ.	2	3	5		1131/1397	4.52	4.72	4.28	4.18	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	4	2		1345/1583	4.22	4.67	4.19	4.01	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	4	2		1160/1532	4.11	4.40	4.01	3.88	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	964/1504		4.23	4.05	3.78	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	5	0	4	2	1		1576/1612	4.01	4.36	4.16	4.10	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	595/1635	4.63	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	4	5	0	2	3.00	1477/1579	4.10	4.55	4.08	3.95	3.00
Lecture				_	_	_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	T	2	5	1		1442/1518		4.70	4.43	4.38	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	802/1520	4.89	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	2	2	2		1453/1517	4.14	4.65	4.27	4.20	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1297/1550	4.44	4.60	4.22	4.17	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	838/1295	4.17	4.45	3.94	3.84	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	q	0	0	Ω	2	1	1	3.75	965/1398	4.23	4.25	4.07	3.85	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1391	4.56	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	834/1388	4.54	4.42	4.28	4.01	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	1	Τ.	1		****/ 958	2.96	4.18	3.93	3.71	****
T. WELE SPECIAL LECHNIQUES SUCCESSIUL	9	Т	U	Τ	Т	U	Т	3.33	/ 958	2.90	4.18	3.93	3./1	.,
Fre		Dist	rib	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3		
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	10		
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0 #### - Me		there	are not enough	not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant			
				I	0	Other	10						
				?	2								

Course-Section: MUSC 170 0201 University of Maryland BEGINNING VOICE CLASS Baltimore County

Title Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE Fall 2007

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 8

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

2

Ρ

I

2

0

1

- ·			
Student.	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 1139

FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

	Questions					NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 General	 ı															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	Genera. ew insights,ski:		om this course	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	7	4.88	196/1639	4.88	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.88
-	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1639	4.88	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.88
		uestions reflect		_	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
	_	uations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1583	4.83	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.83
				what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	506/1532		4.40	4.01	3.88	4.33
	_	_		to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	3		291/1504		4.23	4.05	3.78	4.60
		g system clearly		_	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1612		4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
		was class cance	-		0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
	-			ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.67
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	1	5	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.83
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.86
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1517	4.86	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.86
		es contribute to			2	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	832/1550	4.33	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.33
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	your understanding	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.84	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.67
				ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00
		_	_	nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.42	4.28	4.01	4.50
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful	-	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	4.18	3.93	3.71	4.67
	Fr				encv	Dist	trib	ıt.i.or	า									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	3			Ty	рe			Majors	\$
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4					Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	e e	0	Majo		0	
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0																		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ger	nera:	l				5	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	8	
84-150						General												

Electives

Other

2

0

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Questionnaires: 1

Course-Section: MUSC 172A 0101 Page 1140 Title DICTION FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 1

		_			
Ctudant	('Ollred	F'772	luation	Question	22122

			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	1	0	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 174 0101 University of Maryland Page 1141
Title BEG VOCAL METHODS Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 8

								Fr	eauei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1																
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,skil	lls fro	om this cou	rse	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1497/1639	3.50	4.66	4.27	4.08	3.50
2. Did t	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goa	ls	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	1536/1639	3.33	4.62	4.22	4.17	3.33
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflect	t the ϵ	expected go	als	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1397	****	4.72	4.28	4.18	****
4. Did o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goa	ls	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1324/1583	3.67	4.67	4.19	4.01	3.67
5. Did a	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ute to	what you l	earned	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.00
6. Did w	ritten as:	signments contri	ibute t	o what you	learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	3.78	****
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained		0	1	4	0	0	1	0	1.60	1603/1612	1.60	4.36	4.16	4.10	1.60
8. How m	any times	was class cance	elled			0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.50
9. How w	low would you grade the overall teaching effective				tiveness	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1364/1579	3.40	4.55	4.08	3.95	3.40
		Lecture	e																
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared		3	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.00
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem intere	ested i	in the subj	ect	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was 1	ecture ma	terial presented	d and ϵ	explained c	learly	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.00
4. Did t	he lectur	es contribute to	o what	you learne	d	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.67
		Discuss	sion																
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contribu	ute to	what you l	earned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00
2. Were	all stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to parti	cipate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage f	fair ar	nd open dis	cussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00
4. Were	special to	echniques succes	ssful	-		4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.71	****
					Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
								- 											
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 178A 0101 University of Maryland Title BEG KEYBOARD SKILLS

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 11

Page 1142 FEB 13, 2008 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	Λ	0	0	0	1	2	Ω	4.64	469/1639	4.54	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	Ω	4.55	476/1639	4.72	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	517/1397	4.75	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	402/1583	4.79	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	0	0	0		****/1532	****	4.40	4.19	3.88	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	1	0	1	0		1494/1504	2.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	4.55	449/1612		4.23	4.16	4.10	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	6	4		1402/1635		4.54	4.65	4.56	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	1		1071/1579		4.55	4.08	3.95	
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	U	4	O	1	3.09	10/1/13/9	3.70	4.55	4.00	3.93	3.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	1318/1520	4.33	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	973/1517	4.17	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1328/1550	3.50	4.60	4.22	4.17	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	459/1295		4.45	3.94	3.84	4.25
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1373/1398	2.33	4.25	4.07	3.85	2.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	1385/1391	2.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.01	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 50		4.78	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 32		4.40	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 43		4.69	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
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	Į.
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 178A 0201 University of Maryland Title BEG KEYBOARD SKILLS

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1143

FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

BEITH, NANCY S Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	æ		MB	NA	Fre	eque: 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Ran	k	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescion	5 																
		Genera	1																
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	n this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	698/1	639	4.54	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.44
2. Did the	e instruc	or make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	142/1	639	4.72	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.89
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1	397	4.75	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalua	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1	583	4.79	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to 1	what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1	532	****	4.40	4.01	3.88	****
6. Did wr:	itten ass:	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1	504	2.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	****
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	197/1	612	4.66	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.78
8. How man	ny times w	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1374/1	635	4.20	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.22
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1232/1	579	3.78	4.55	4.08	3.95	3.67
		Lectur	е																
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	prepared	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1	518	4.50	4.70	4.43	4.38	****
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem inter	ested in	n the subject	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1	520	4.33	4.85	4.70	4.61	****
3. Was led	cture mate	erial presente	d and ex	xplained clearly	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1	517	4.17	4.65	4.27	4.20	****
4. Did the	e lecture:	s contribute t	contribute to what you learned					0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1	550	3.50	4.60	4.22	4.17	****
5. Did aud	diovisual	visual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1	295	4.25	4.45	3.94	3.84	****
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute to v	what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1	398	2.33	4.25	4.07	3.85	****
2. Were al	ll student	s actively en	courage	d to participate	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1	391	2.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	****
3. Did the	e instruc	or encourage	fair and	d open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1	388	****	4.42	4.28	4.01	****
		Self	Paced																
1. Did sel	lf-paced :	system contrib	ute to v	what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did st	udy quest:	ions make clea	r the ex	spected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were yo	our contac	cts with the i	nstructo	or helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	43	****	4.69	4.69	4.69	****
		k/tutoring by			8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
		gh proctors for	-	_	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio:	n										
Credits Ea	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				D.O.	agan	,				Tr. m	20			Majors	
		Cuiii. GPA	Expected Grades					asons					Тур				Majors	; 	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7		Rec	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	;	0	Grad	uate	9	0	Majo	r	8	
28-55 56-83	2	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	B 2 C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Unde:	r-ar	rad	9	Non-	major	1	
84-150	1	D 0														3	_		
Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	1 1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0			Means t			_	ſh
				P 0 I 0		O+1	ner					9	resp	onse	es to b	e sign	nifican	t	
				- 0		0.01						-							

Course-Section: MUSC 179A 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County INTER KEYBOARD SKILLS

Ρ

I

0

0

Page 1144 Title FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eanei	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
		General	 I															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,skil	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	870/1639	4.31	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.28
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	517/1639		4.62	4.22	4.17	4.50
		estions reflect		_	1	10	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1397		4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
	_	ations reflect			0	6	0	0	0	1	11	4.92			4.67	4.19	4.01	4.92
				what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	2	1		****/1532		4.40	4.01	3.88	****
	_	_		o what you learned	0	12	2	1	2	0	1		1477/1504		4.23	4.05	3.78	2.50
		system clearly		_	0	2	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	293/1612	4.51	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.69
		was class cance	_		0	0	0	0	0	12	6	4.33	1288/1635	4.39	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.33
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	1	7	6	3	3.65	1245/1579	3.97	4.55	4.08	3.95	3.65
1 Were t	he instru	prepared	15	0	0	0	0	Ω	3	5 00	****/1518	4.67	4.70	4.43	4.38	****		
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1520		4.85	4.70	4.61	****
				explained clearly	15 16	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1517		4.65	4.27	4.20	****
		s contribute to		-	15	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/1550		4.60	4.22	4.17	****
				our understanding	15	1	0	1	0	0	1		****/1295		4.45	3.94	3.84	****
		Self I	banes															
1 Did se	lf-paced			what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	Ω	2	5 00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****
		ions make clear			16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32		4.40	4.51	4.67	****
		cts with the in			16	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 43		4.69	4.69	4.69	****
_		k/tutoring by p		_	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 32		5.00	4.37	4.67	****
		gh proctors for		_	16	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 21		5.00	4.52	5.00	****
				Frequ	onat	, Diat	- r i bı	1+101	_									
				riequ	епсу	DISC	LIDU	10101	.1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	 s	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	14	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 3			_			-						,		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh

Other

16

responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 179A 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County INTER KEYBOARD SKILLS Instructor:

Page 1145 FEB 13, 2008 BEITH, NANCY S Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Ouestion:	2		MB	NA		_	ncies	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
			Genera	1															
1. D	id you ga	in nev	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	814/1639	4.31	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.33
2. D	id the in	struct	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	466/1639	4.53	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.56
3. D:	id the ex	am que	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	1	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	517/1397	4.75	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.50
4. D:	id other	evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	3	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	697/1583	4.63	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.33
5. D:	id assign	ed rea	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	633/1532	4.20	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.20
6. D:	id writte	n ass:	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	3	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1371/1504	2.83	4.23	4.05	3.78	3.17
7. Wa	as the gr	ading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	718/1612	4.51	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.33
8. Ho	ow many t	imes v	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1195/1635	4.39	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.44
9. Ho	ow would	you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	623/1579	3.97	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.29
			Lecture			6	0												
		the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	1			602/1518		4.70	4.43	4.38	4.67
		the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	1	0	0			1414/1520		4.85	4.70	4.61	
		s lecture material presented and explained clear					0	1	0	0	0			1292/1517			4.27	4.20	3.67
			s contribute to		-	6	0	1	0	0	0			1274/1550		4.60	4.22	4.17	3.67
5. D:	id audiov	isual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.84	****
1 -			Discus			_	0	-	-	•	•	0	2 05	1005/1000	2 05	4 05	4 05	2 05	2 05
					what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	0	2		1207/1398		4.25	4.07	3.85	3.25
					d to participate	5	0	1 2	0	0	2	1		1220/1391		4.36	4.30	4.07	3.50
			_		d open discussion	5	0 1	∠ 1	0	0	0 1			1320/1388		4.42	4.28	4.01	
4. W	ere speci	aı te	chniques succe	SSIUI		5	Τ	Τ	U	U	Τ	Т	3.33	786/ 958	3.33	4.18	3.93	3.71	3.33
					Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ıtioı	n									
Cred	its Earne	d	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-2	27 0		0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	7
28-5	55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1																		
56-8							Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	2
84-1	150 1																		
Grad	d. 0		3.50-4.00	F 0		El	ecti	res				0	#### - 1				_	ιh	
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
					I 0		Ot1	her					7						
					? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0101

Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Enrollment:

18 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1146 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	1	0	0	1	0	1.0	4	4 12	1000/1620	4 04	1 66	4 07	4 00	4 12
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1 1	0	0	1 0	0 2	10 2	4 11	4.13	1029/1639 415/1639	4.24	4.66 4.62	4.27 4.22	4.08 4.17	4.13 4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.60	302/1397		4.62	4.22	4.17	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	1	2	9	4.73	524/1583		4.72	4.28	4.18	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	0	5	2	2		1300/1532		4.40	4.19	3.88	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	9	0	0	2	1	1		1051/1504		4.23	4.05	3.78	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	340/1612		4.23	4.16	4.10	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635		4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	889/1579		4.55			4.00
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		_	O	O	2		2	1.00	005/15/5	1.05	1.55	1.00	3.75	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	684/1518	4.67	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	1115/1520	4.83	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	648/1517	4.68	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	832/1550	4.57	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	709/1295	4.15	4.45	3.94	3.84	3.93
_, ,														
Discussion	_		_	_	_	_	_		======================================					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	728/1398		4.25	4.07	3.85	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	662/1391	4.46	4.36	4.30		4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	7 7	0 3	1	0	1 2	0 1	7	4.33	783/1388	4.10	4.42	4.28		4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	/	3	U	U	2	1	3	4.17	399/ 958	4.17	4.18	3.93	3.71	4.1/
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
Field Work	1 -	0	0	^	0	0	1	F 00	**** / FO		2 50	4 0 4	2 61	***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0 1	0	Ţ		****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0 0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05 4.75	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15 15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 42 ****/ 37	****	4.83	4.75	4.79 5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 32		4.33	4.58	4.60	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	^^^^/ 32		4.33	4.56	4.60	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****
P		D. J												

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	7	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	qnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	•	_	

? 0

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0201 University of Maryland Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS Baltimore County

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1147

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	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	Ο	1	1	2	8	4.42	740/1639	4.24	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	115/1639	4.65	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	145/1397	4.73	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1583	4.63	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	934/1532	3.73	4.40	4.01	3.88	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	245/1504	4.14	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	617/1612		4.36	4.16	4.10	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	725/1579		4.55	4.08	3.95	4.20
Lecture	0	•	_	•	0	_	_	4 55	454/1510	4 60	4 50	4 42	4 20	4 55
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.75	454/1518	4.67	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	4.83	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	Ţ	11	4.92	141/1517	4.68	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	Τ	2	9	4.67	457/1550	4.57	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	Τ	U	6	4	4.18	513/1295	4.15	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1271/1398	3.91	4.25	4.07	3.85	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	863/1391	4.46	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1157/1388	4.10	4.42	4.28	4.01	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 958	4.17	4.18	3.93	3.71	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0301

Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 18

84-150

Grad.

2

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

5

0

D

F

Ρ

Ι

?

0

0

0

0

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1148 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ougstions							Fr	eque	ncies	5		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 vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	0	0	1	0	1	9	7	4.17	990/1639	4.24	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.17
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44			4.62	4.22	4.17	4.44
		estions reflec			1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53			4.72	4.28	4.18	4.53
	_	ations reflect			0	6	0	1	0	4	7	4.42			4.67	4.19	4.01	4.42
				what you learned	0	7	0	1	3	3	4	3.91			4.40	4.01	3.88	3.91
				to what you learned	0	11	1	0	1	1	4	4.00			4.23	4.05	3.78	4.00
		signments contr s system clearl		_	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44			4.36	4.16	4.10	4.44
		was class cand		ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635		4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
				ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	,		4.55			4.08
9. HOW WO	ouia you g	grade the overa	II tead	ming effectiveness	5	U	U	U	2	8	3	4.08	84//15/9	4.09	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.08
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.67
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	597/1520	4.83	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.89
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	428/1517	4.68	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.65
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	388/1550	4.57	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.72
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	6	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	398/1295	4.15	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.33
	Discussion																	
1 Did al	agg diggs			what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	355/1398	3.91	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.63
				ed to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75			4.36	4.30		4.75
				nd open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.75			4.42	4.28	4.07	4.75
		_		id open discussion	10	5	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 958					****
4. Were S	special te	chniques succe	ssiui		10	5	U	U	1	U	۷	4.33	""""/ 950	4.17	4.18	3.93	3.71	
		Labora																
2. Were y	ou provid	led with adequa	te back	ground information	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	***
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	***	4.78	4.45	4.54	****
	_	ions make clea		_	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****
		acts with the i			16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	4.69	****
_		k/tutoring by		_	16	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32		5.00	4.37	4.67	****
		igh proctors for			16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21		5.00	4.52	5.00	****
						- -												
Fre					iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 15					Rec	auir	ed f	or Ma	ior		0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0	
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 1									. ,	-	-	~~~	-	-			ŭ	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1			1	.0	Under-9	rad 1	L8	Non-	major	18
04 150	2	2.00-2.99	_	C 0		061	c.a	-					OHACI -9	144 1	- 0	14011		10

Electives

Other

4

1

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 181 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE PIANO CLA

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1149

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies		Instructor		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	4	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1136/1532	3.67	4.40	4.01	3.88	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	766/1635	4.83	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	496/1579	4.40	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1115/1520	4.60	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	944/1550	4.20	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	398/1295	4.33	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	1		1130/1388	3.67	4.42	4.28	4.01	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful			0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958		4.18	3.93	3.71	4.50
Frequ	encv	Dist	trib	utio	า									

Credits Earned Cum. GPA				Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	5	Under-grad	6	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 188 0101 University of Maryland Title PERCUSSION CLASS Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Enrollment: 18 Ouestionnaires: 18

0

1

4

2.00-2.99 1

3.00-3.49 0

3.50-4.00 4

56-83

84-150

Grad.

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1150

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Non-major 10

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Ouestions Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 4 0 0 0 4 10 4.71 366/1639 4.71 4.66 4.27 4.08 4.71 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4 0 0 0 0 2 12 4.86 163/1639 4.86 4.62 4.22 4.17 4.86 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4 1 0 0 1 0 12 4.85 202/1397 4.85 4.72 4.28 4.18 4.85 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 4 2 0 1 0 2 9 4.58 392/1583 4.58 4.67 4.19 4.01 4.58 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 6 0 0 2 1 5 4.38 469/1532 4.38 4.40 4.01 3.88 4.38 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 12 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1504 **** 4.23 4.05 3.78 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 4 1 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 924/1612 4.15 4.36 4.16 4.10 4.15 8. How many times was class cancelled 4 0 0 0 0 0 14 5.00 1/1635 5.00 4.54 4.65 4.56 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 7 4 4.36 538/1579 4.36 4.55 4.08 3.95 4.36 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 7 0 0 Ω 0 5 6 4.55 757/1518 4.55 4.70 4.43 4.38 4.55 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.85 4.70 4.61 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 7 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 439/1517 4.64 4.65 4.27 4.20 4.64 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 3 8 4.73 388/1550 4.73 4.60 4.22 4.17 4.73 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 7 5 0 0 1 0 5 4.67 185/1295 4.67 4.45 3.94 3.84 4.67 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 1 4 3 4.25 625/1398 4.25 4.25 4.07 3.85 4.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 1 0 0 3 4 4.13 919/1391 4.13 4.36 4.30 4.07 4.13 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 1 0 1 2 4 4.00 944/1388 4.00 4.42 4.28 4.01 4.00 4. Were special techniques successful 10 2 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 201/ 958 4.50 4.18 3.93 3.71 4.50 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 240 **** 1.00 4.11 4.01 **** Seminar 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** *** 4.47 4.39 **** 17 0 0 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 3.50 4.04 3.61 **** 0 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 53 **** 3.50 4.05 3.51 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 50 **** 4.78 4.45 4.54 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Majors Reasons ______ 00 - 274 0.00-0.99 1 A 10 Required for Majors 0 Graduate Major 28-55 1.00-1.99 0 В 2

General

Other

Electives

3

3

Under-grad 18

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

C 0

D 0

F 0

I 0

Questionnaires: 16

Course-Section	: MUSC 189 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1151
Title	GUITAR CLASS	Baltimore County	FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:	FORSHEE, ZANE	Fall 2007	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	16		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	880/1639	4.27	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.2
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	156/1639	4.87	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.8
. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	230/1397	4.80	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.8
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	128/1583	4.92	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.9
. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	178/1532	4.75	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.7
. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	3.78	***
. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	837/1612	4.23	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.2
. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	11	0	3.73	1591/1635	3.73	4.54	4.65	4.56	3.
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $% \left(1\right) =\left[1\right] \left[$	2	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	623/1579	4.29	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.2
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	301/1518	4.85	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.8
. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	872/1520	4.77	4.85	4.70	4.61	4.
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	511/1550	4.62	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.
. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	398/1295	4.33	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.3
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	3.85	**
. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.07	**
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.01	**
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Predits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	5

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA			Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h	
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	2					
				2	1							

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0101 University of Maryland Title PIANO Baltimore County Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE Fall 2007

5

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Page 1152
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

- · ·				
Student	('Ollred	Fivaluation	Ouestionnaire	

			Fr	eque:	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	e 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	3	5.00	1/1639	4.75	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1639	4.46	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1288/1635	4.42	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1579	4.67	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.84	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	4.67	4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00
Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 2		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	aior:	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Maio	 r	0

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0101 University of Maryland Page 1153 Title PIANO Baltimore County

Questionnaires: 4

FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 HAWLEY, THOMAS Instructor: Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 6

		_			
Ctudant	('Ollred	F'772	luation	Question	22122

	Frequencies							Inst	Instructor		e 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	0	3	4.50	615/163	9 4.75	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	859/163	9 4.46	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1010/158	3 4.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/161	2 5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1135/163	5 4.42	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	569/157	9 4.67	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.33
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	37/ 5	0 4.67	4.78	4.45	4.54	4.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 3	2 5.00	4.40	4.51	4.67	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	34/ 4	3 4.67	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.33
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 3	2 5.00	5.00	4.37	4.67	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students		2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 2	1 5.00	5.00	4.52	5.00	5.00
Frem	anas	ni a	-rih	1+ 1 01	n									

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0101

Title VOICE

Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1154 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	cructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	-1		^	^	^	1	4	4 00	057/1620	4 00	1	4 07	4 00	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	4		257/1639 415/1639		4.66 4.62	4.27 4.22	4.08	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	T	0 3	0	0	0	_	_	4.60	-,				4.17	4.60 ****
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	-	0	-	0	0	1		****/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583		4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	Τ	3	0	0	0	0	2		1/1532		4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	0	2	1		718/1612		4.36	4.16	4.10	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2			1067/1635		4.54	4.65	4.56	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1579	4.80	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	Ο	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520		4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550		4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00
1. Did the rectard contribute to what you rearned	-	J	Ü	Ü	J	O	_	3.00	1/1330	3.00	1.00	1.22	1.1/	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.07	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.01	****
0.16 7. 1														
Self Paced		•	0	_	0	0	_	F 00	1 / 50	F 00	4 50	4 45	4 = 4	- 00
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50		4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32		4.40	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/ 43		4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	5	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0101 University of Maryland VOICE Baltimore County SMITH, DAVID Instructor:

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

3

Page 1155 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	n Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	----------	----------

	Frequencies							Inst	tructor	Course	Course Dept		UMBC 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	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	4.90	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	4.80	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	4.67	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.30	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	4.80	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: MUSC 190C 0101 University of Maryland Page 1156
Title VIOLIN Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

6

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept UMBC Le		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	5	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639		4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/1397		4.72	4.28	4.18	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/1583		4.67	4.19	4.01	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/1532		4.40	4.01	3.88	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	814/1612		4.36	4.16	4.10	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1497/1635		4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1579		4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520		4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517		4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.84	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	Ω	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	4	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32		4.40	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 43		4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 32		5.00	4.37	4.67	5.00
1. was the recasacity eacoring by proceeds herpful		_	J	J	J	J	ر	3.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	1.57	1.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

1 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** 5.00 4.52 5.00 ****

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190D 0101 University of Maryland VIOLA Baltimore County

Page 1157 Title FEB 13, 2008 BUSCHEK, KIMBER Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Enrollment:

1

		Frequencies					Inst	Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC 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	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00
Frequency Distribution														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		0	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	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1	
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	1	
				P	0			responses to	responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0	-	-	-		
				2	Λ							

Course-Section: MUSC 190I 0101	University of Maryland	Р
Title FLUTE	Baltimore County	FEB

Questionnaires: 2

Page 1158 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: KESNER, LORI Fall 2007 Enrollment: 3

Ctudent	COURCE	Fralustion	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncie	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	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section:	MUSC 190K 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1159
Title	CLARINET	Baltimore County	FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:	DICHADDG MICHA	Rall 2007	TOP TEESUS

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title CLARINET Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 4

			Fre	equer	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	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 1900 0101 University of Maryland RECORDER Baltimore County

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

Page 1160 Title FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 MORIN, JOSEPH Instructor:

Student	Courge	Evra.	luation	Ouestion	naire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	actor	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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.84	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	•		
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190S 0101 University of Maryland Page 1161
Title PERCUSSION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: HUMPHREYS, MICH Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 6

(Duestionnaires:	3	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
,	uescionnaires.	3	Scudenc	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	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 vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.67
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.67
		estions reflec			0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	1	0	0	0	1	1		476/1583	4.50	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.50
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
	_	g system clearl		-	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1606/1612	1.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	1.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1001/1635	4.67	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.67
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.55		3.95	4.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.50
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.65	4.27	4.20	4.50
		es contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00
2. Did st	udy quest	tions make clea	r the e	xpected goal	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	4.40	4.51	4.67	5.00
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	37/ 43	4.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	 0.00-0.99	0	A 2					or Ma			·	 Graduat		 0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 2 B 1		кес	quir	eu I	OT Mg	a JOE'S	>	U	Graduat	E	U	мајс)Τ	U
26-33 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Go	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad	3	Non	-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		Gei	пета	Τ.				_	onder-9	Lau	5	MOII-	iia jui	3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		គ្ន	ecti [.]	7760				2	#### -	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	_	P 0		1516	CCLI	v C D				4	respons				_	111
	I 0					O+1	her					0	respons	co LU L	e sigi	ııı.cal.	10	
				5 0		ULI	TIET					U						
				: U														

Course-Sectio	n: MUSC 190U 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1162
Title	HARP	Baltimore County	FEB 13, 2008
T	DOLL WILL TAGOLIE	H-11 2007	T-1 TDDD 2020

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

800 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: POLLAUF, JACQUE Fall 2007 Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

	Frequencies					Instr	uctor	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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	Ο	0	0	0	Ο	Ο	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

I

?

0

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0301 Title RECITAL PREPARATION Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL Fall 2007

Enrollment:	23
0	0

Questionnaires: 9

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Page 1163

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

						Frequencies			Inst	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 vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	814/1639	4.33	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.33
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.67
		uestions reflec		_	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
	_	uations reflect		_	0	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.60
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
	_	-		o what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.67
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	122/1579	4.86	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.86
	Lecture																	
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
		ctor seem inter			5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
				explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
		es contribute t			5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00
				our understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.84	5.00
ו הגם ו		Discus			2	0	0	0	^	0	_	г оо	1 /1200	г оо	4 05	4 07	2 05	F 00
				what you learned	3	-	-	-	0	0	6	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00
		_	_	ed to participate	3	0 0	0	0	0	0	6 6	5.00 5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00
		ctor encourage echniques succe		d open discussion	3	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388 1/ 958	5.00 5.00	4.42	4.28	3.71	5.00
					_	_	-	_	-		-		_,,					
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 A 8		Red	 สมร์ ห	 ed fo	or Ma			0	Graduat		0	Majo	 r	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		1000	darr.	Ju I	JI 1410	י דט כי ג	ی	U	Graduat	_	U	ı-ıa je	<i>,</i> _	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General				0	Under-q	rad	9	Non-	major	1			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	OCITCE AT						511461 5144 5				3			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives				0	#### - Means there are not			enouc	_j h				
				Р 0									respons				_	•
				_								_						

Other

6

Course-Section	: MUSC 193A 0101	University of	Maryland	Page 1164
Title	PIANO	Baltimore (ounty	FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:	FRANKLIN, RACHE	Fall 2	007	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Instr	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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
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	i
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	Ο						

Course-Section	n: MUSC 193B 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1165
Title	VOICE	Baltimore County	FEB 13, 2008
Ingtrugtor:	TACKCOM TANTOR	E-11 2007	Tob TDDD2020

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

11616	v	OICE	Darcimore	Country	FED 13, 200
Instr	uctor: J	ACKSON, JANICE	Fall	2007	Job IRBR302
Enrol	lment:	5			

Questionnaires: 4

	Frequencies					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	1	0	3	4.50	615/1639	4.75	4.66	4.27	4.08	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	252/1639	4.88	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.50	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1044/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1135/1635	4.45	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	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	ı
				P	0	HICCEIVES		responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0101

VOICE

Title Instructor: SMITH, DAVID

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1166 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eanei	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	Questions NR NA 1 2 3		4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	4.75	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	4.88	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397		4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1583		4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	3.78	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1612		4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2		1235/1635	4.45	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517		4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.84	****
Discussion		•	0	0	•	0	-	F 00	**** / 1 2 0 0	****	4 05	4 05	2 05	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1398		4.25	4.07	3.85	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.07	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1388 ****/ 958	****	4.42 4.18	4.28 3.93	4.01 3.71	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 956		4.10	3.93	3.71	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	1.00	4.11	4.01	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	***
S S														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	3.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	3.51	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	4.83	4.75	4.79	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	***	4.33	4.56	4.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	5.00	4.78	4.45	4.54	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	***

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0101

Title VOICE

Instructor: SMITH, DAVID

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1166 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	1
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 193C 0101

VIOLIN

5

YOSHIOKA, AIRI

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Page 1167 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						-			ructor	-				Sect				
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1001/1635	4.67	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.67
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.67
		Lectur	е															
		actor's lecture			2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.84	5.00
		Discus																
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398		4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.18	3.93	3.71	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	es Reasons								Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0					 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		2			
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		1.0.	-1011	ca I	O1 110	. ,	_	ū	Gradac	_	•	11000	-	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	3	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0 D 0			001		_				-	011001 9		-	2.011		-
Grad.			= *		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - Means there are not enough			ıh			
				P 0									respons				_	•
				I 0		Ot1	her					2						
				? 0			-											

Course-Section: MUSC 193F 0101 University of Maryland Title GUITAR Baltimore County Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS Fall 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

8

University of Maryland Page 1168
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies				Instructor		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	8	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	859/1639	4.25	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	850/1397	4.20	4.72	4.28	4.18	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	281/1583	4.71	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.40	4.01	3.88	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	313/1504	4.57	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	955/1612	4.13	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1441/1635	4.13	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	623/1579	4.29	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	398/1295	4.33	4.45	3.94	3.84	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	260/1398	4.75	4.25	4.07	3.85	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.07	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.42	4.28	4.01	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.18	3.93	3.71	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.78	4.45	4.54	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.40	4.51	4.67	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful			0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	***
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 193K 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1169
Title	CLARINET	Baltimore County	FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:	DICHYDDG WICHY	Eall 2007	Tob TDBD3020

Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
Enrollment: 2 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	2		
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Dept		t 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	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.84	5.00
Frequ	ency.	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
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	ı
				P	0	EICCLIVES		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193S 0101 University of Maryland Page 1170
Title PERCUSSION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: HUMPHREYS, MICH Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 1

C	uestionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
~	acberonnaries.	±	Deddelle	COULDC	DValuation	Queberonnarie

		Frequencies					Instru	actor	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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.84	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.18	3.93	3.71	5.00
Frequ	ency	n Dist	-rih	ut i oı	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193W 0101 University of Maryland UPRIGHT BASS Baltimore County Instructor: RUAS, LAURA

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

3

Page 1171 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Onestionna	ire

			Fre	equei	ncies	S		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	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1288/1635	4.33	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	0
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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 194A 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title PIANO Fall 2007 FRANKLIN, RACHE Instructor:

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Page 1172 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

-				
Ctudant	('Ollred	Evaluation	Ougetion	מעוכמו

							Fr	eque:	ncies	5		Ins	tructor		Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	k	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
		was class canc		. 3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1	635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
		Lectur	e																
l. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1515/1	517	1.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	1.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1549/1	550	1.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	1.00
		Discus																	
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00
B. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00
		Labora	-																
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	234/	240	1.00	1.00	4.11	4.01	1.00
		Field																	
				hat you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0		1.00	48/	52				3.61	
2. Did yo	u clearly	y understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	52/	53	1.00	3.50	4.05	3.51	1.00
		Self																	
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/	50	5.00		4.45	4.54	5.00
		acts with the i			0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/	43	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.69	5.00
1. Was the	e feedba	ck/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1,/	32	5.00	5.00	4.37	4.67	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio:	n										
Credits E	its Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Re	asons	5				Тур	pe			Majors	;
00-27	27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1			A 1		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Grad	uate	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		в 0			_			-							3			
56-83			C 0		Ge:	nera	1				1	Unde	r-qı	rad	1	Non-	-major	0	
84-150													J-				3		
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				0	####	- N	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
															es to k			_	•
I O						Ot:	her					0				5-			
	5 0 I 0										-								
				. 0															

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 194B 0101 Fall 2007 HUBBARD, JOYCE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

VOICE

3

Page 1173 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Cou	ırse Evalı	uation Q	uesti	onnai	re
-------------	------------	----------	-------	-------	----

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	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	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1520		4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1517		4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550		4.60	4.22	4.17	5.00
	_	_		-	-	-	_		_,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	3.85	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.07	5.00
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.01	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.18	3.93	3.71	5.00
P		<u> </u>	.,											

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194F 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County GUITAR

Page 1174 FEB 13, 2008 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3			
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	t Cours	3

			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	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.62	4.22	4.17	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.67	4.19	4.01	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.23	4.05	3.78	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.60	4.22	4.17	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
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	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 1940	3 0101	University of	f Maryland	Page 1175
Title CLASSICAI	GUITAR	Baltimore	County	FEB 13, 2008
<pre>Instructor: FORSHEE,</pre>	ZANE	Fall	2007	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1				
Questionnaires:	1	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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.01	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	5.00
Fre		Dist	cribu	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 194S 0101 University of Maryland Page 1176 PERCUSSION Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Title Instructor: HUMPHREYS, MICH Fall 2007 Enrollment: 2

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.08	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	3.88	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.55	4.08	3.95	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.38	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.20	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Discussion

Questionnaires: 1

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1398 5.00 4.25 4.07 3.85 5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d 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	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
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	
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	-	,	
				2	n						

Course-Section: MUSC 210 0101 University of Maryland MUSICIANSHIP LAB III Title Baltimore County

Instructor: CELLA, LISA Enrollment: 13

Ouestionnaires: 13

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1177

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 3 0 0 0 0 2 8 4.80 257/1639 4.82 4.66 4.27 4.35 4.80 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3 0 0 0 0 0 10 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 3 4 0 0 0 6 5.00 1/1639 4.92 4.62 4.22 4.27 5.00 1/1397 4.92 4.72 4.28 4.39 5.00 1/1583 4.82 4.67 4.19 4.28 5.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3 6 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 178/1532 4.88 4.40 4.01 4.09 4.75 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 5 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 667/1504 4.41 4.23 4.05 4.09 4.20 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3 0 0 0 2 3 5 4.30 756/1612 4.33 4.36 4.16 4.21 4.30 8. How many times was class cancelled 3 0 0 0 0 10 0 4.00 1497/1635 4.31 4.54 4.65 4.63 4.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 205/1579 4.72 4.55 4.08 4.14 4.71 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 8 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 360/1518 4.80 4.70 4.43 4.48 4.80 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 725/1520 4.83 4.85 4.70 4.78 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 239/1517 4.80 4.65 4.27 4.34 4.80 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1550 5.00 4.60 4.22 4.33 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 3 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1295 **** 4.45 3.94 4.07 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1398 **** 4.25 4.07 4.14 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1391 **** 4.36 4.30 4.35 **** 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1388 **** 4.42 4.28 4.37 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 4. Were special techniques successful 11 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 958 **** 4.18 3.93 4.00 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_	_		
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 210 0201 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB III Fall 2007 Instructor: CELLA, LISA

Enrollment: 14 Quest

Page 1178

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

estionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation	Questionnaire
--	---------------

			Fre	equer	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	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	222/1639	4.82	4.66	4.27	4.35	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	170/1639	4.92	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	202/1397	4.92	4.72	4.28	4.39	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	347/1583	4.82	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1532	4.88	4.40	4.01	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	275/1504	4.41	4.23	4.05	4.09	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	681/1612	4.33	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1056/1635	4.31	4.54	4.65	4.63	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	197/1579	4.72	4.55	4.08	4.14	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1518	4.80	4.70	4.43	4.48	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1520	4.83	4.85	4.70	4.78	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1517	4.80	4.65	4.27	4.34	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.33	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1391		4.36	4.30	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1388		4.42	4.28	4.37	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 958		4.18	3.93	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	3.24	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 43		4.69	4.69		****
Theorem		D	2 1											

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 217 0101 University of Maryland Title ROCK & RELATED MUSIC

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1179

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BOYD, MICHAEL Enrollment: 183

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Questionnaires: 78

									Fre	_	ncie	:s		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	id von a	ain new	insights,ski	=	m this cour	S.P.	0	0	2	1	10	18	47	4.37	780/1639	4.37	4.66	4.27	4.35	4.37
			or make clear				0	0	0	5	12	26	35	4.17	948/1639		4.62	4.22	4.27	4.17
			stions reflec				0	0	2	6	10	22	38	4.13	916/1397		4.72	4.28	4.39	4.13
		_	tions reflect				1	37	0	3	5	7	25	4.35	669/1583		4.67	4.19	4.28	4.35
			dings contrib	_			2	0	3	4	17	20	32	3.97	815/1532		4.40	4.01	4.09	3.97
6. Di	id writt	en assi	gnments contr	ibute to	what you	learned	3	56	2	1	5	2	9	3.79	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	4.09	****
7. Wa	as the g	rading	system clearly	y explai	ined		1	0	1	5	8	10	53	4.42	617/1612	4.42	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.42
8. Ho	ow many	imes w	as class canc	elled			2	4	0	0	0	33	39	4.54	1107/1635	4.54	4.54	4.65	4.63	4.54
9. Ho	ow would	you gr	ade the overa	ll teach	ning effect	iveness	9	1	0	3	14	34	17	3.96	972/1579	3.96	4.55	4.08	4.14	3.96
			Lectur	٩																
1. We	ere the	instruc	tor's lecture		prepared		3	0	0	0	4	11	60	4.75	472/1518	4.75	4.70	4.43	4.48	4.75
			or seem inter			ct	2	0	0	1	3		60	4.72	943/1520		4.85	4.70	4.78	4.72
			rial presente		_		1	0	0	2	5	19	51	4.55	547/1517	4.55	4.65	4.27	4.34	4.55
			contribute t				1	1	0	1	8	11	56	4.61	522/1550		4.60	4.22	4.33	4.61
5. Di	id audio	visual	techniques en	hance yo	our underst	anding	3	0	0	2	10	11	52	4.51	265/1295	4.51	4.45	3.94	4.07	4.51
			Discus	sion																
1. Di	id class	discus	sions contrib		what vou le	arned	49	0	6	4	4	8	7	3.21	1222/1398	3.21	4.25	4.07	4.14	3.21
			s actively en				48	0	4	4	4	4	14		1177/1391		4.36	4.30	4.35	3.67
			or encourage				49	0	1	4	5	4	15	3.97	980/1388		4.42	4.28	4.37	3.97
			hniques succe				50	18	1	2	1	1	5	3.70	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	4.00	****
			Semina	r																
1. We	ere assi	gned to	pics relevant	_	announced	theme	77	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****
						Frequ	1encs	niet	tri hı	ıtio	m									
						11040	acticy	DIB	CIID	2010	.11									
Credi	its Earn	ed	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-2	27 1)	0.00-0.99	4	А	16		Red	quire	ed f	or M	ajor	s 2	28	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	3
28-5	55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	33														
56-8	33	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	6		Ger	nera:	1			3	3	Under-g	rad 7	8	Non-	major	75
84-1	L50	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	3														
Grad	i.)	3.50-4.00	9	F	0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -					h
					P	1									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
					I	0		Otl	ner					3						
					?	3														

Course-Section: MUSC 218 0101 Title

RECORDING TECHNIQUES

Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 12

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1180 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Ougations			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		 General															
1. Did	vou gain ne	ew insights,skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.66	4.27	4.35	4.67
		ctor make clear the		0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	435/1639		4.62	4.22		4.58
		uestions reflect the		0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	437/1397			4.28		4.58
		uations reflect the		0	1	0	0	1	3	7	4.55			4.67	4.19	4.28	4.55
		eadings contribute t	1 3	1	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	- ,		4.40	4.01		3.82
			to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	824/1504		4.23	4.05		4.00
		g system clearly exp		2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1612		4.36	4.16	4.21	5.00
		was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	1402/1635		4.54	4.65	4.63	4.18
			eaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	241/1579	4.67		4.08		4.67
		Lecture															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures wel	l prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.70	4.43	4.48	4.83
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem interested	l in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.85	4.70	4.78	4.83
3. Was	lecture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.65	4.27	4.34	4.75
4. Did	the lecture	es contribute to wha	at you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.60	4.22	4.33	4.67
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	305/1295	4.45	4.45	3.94	4.07	4.45
		Discussion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contribute t	o what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	560/1398	4.33	4.25	4.07	4.14	4.33
		nts actively encoura		9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.67
			and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1		4.67	,	4.67	4.42	4.28	4.37	4.67
4. Were	special to	echniques successful	_	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.18	3.93	4.00	4.33
		Laboratory															
1. Did	the lab in	crease understanding	g of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	***	****	4.10	4.33	****
		Seminar															
		ons contribute to wh		11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80		****	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were	criteria :	for grading made cle	ear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	***	****	4.16	4.00	****
	C	Field Work				•											
		rience contribute to		11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52		3.50	4.04		****
2. Did	you clearly	y understand your ev	aluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.50	4.05	4.28	****
			Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	ļ
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	В 6						-						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0									3				-	
					_						_						_

Electives

Other

0

9

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

1

Course-Section: MUSC 224 0101 University of Maryland Title INSTRUMENTATION Baltimore County Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J Fall 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

9

Page 1181 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
----------------	------------	---------------

								-	ncies			Inst	tructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	2	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1																
1. Did you	u gain new	insights, ski	lls from	this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/16	539	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.35	5.00
2. Did the	e instruct	or make clear	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	252/16	539	4.75	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.75
3. Did the	e exam que	stions reflect	t the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	182/13	397	4.88	4.72	4.28	4.39	4.88
4. Did otl	her evalua	tions reflect	the expe	cted goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/15	583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.28	5.00
5. Did as	signed rea	dings contrib	ute to wha	at you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	293/15	532	4.57	4.40	4.01	4.09	4.57
6. Did wr	itten assi	gnments contr	ibute to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	275/15	504	4.63	4.23	4.05	4.09	4.63
		system clearly	-	ed	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	603/16	512	4.43	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.43
	-	as class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/16		5.00	4.54	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How wor	uld you gr	ade the overa	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	241/15	579	4.67	4.55	4.08	4.14	4.67
		Lecture	е																
1. Were th	he instruc	tor's lecture:	s well pro	epared	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/15	518	4.80	4.70	4.43	4.48	4.80
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem inter	ested in	the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/15	520	4.80	4.85	4.70	4.78	4.80
3. Was led	cture mate	rial presented	d and exp	lained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/15	517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.34	5.00
		contribute to	_		3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/15		4.80	4.60	4.22	4.33	4.80
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance you	r understanding	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	505/12	295	4.20	4.45	3.94	4.07	4.20
		Discus																	
1. Did cla	ass discus	sions contrib	at you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	260/13	398	4.75	4.25	4.07	4.14	4.75	
2. Were a	ll student	s actively end	to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/13	391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the	e instruct	or encourage :	fair and o	open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/13	888	4.75	4.42	4.28	4.37	4.75
4. Were sp	pecial tec	hniques succes	ssful		4	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	307/ 9	958	4.33	4.18	3.93	4.00	4.33
		Labora	tory																
1. Did the	e lab incr	ease understa	nding of	the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 2	224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were yo	ou provide	d with adequat	te backgr	ound information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 2	240	****	1.00	4.11	4.47	****
		Field V	Work																
1. Did fie	eld experi	ence contribut		t you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	52	****	3.50	4.04	4.78	****
		Self	Dagod																
1 Did se	lf-paced s			at you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	50	****	4.78	4.45	3.24	****
	_	ons make clear		-	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	32	****	4.40	4.51	4.33	****
		tutoring by	_	-	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	32	****	5.00	4.37	1.00	****
		h proctors for	-	-	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/	21	****	5.00		3.00	****
			Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1											
Credits Ea	arnod	Cum. GPA				Por	asons					Тур	20			Majors			
				Expected Grades											·			мајогѕ	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 5		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Gradı	ıate	2	0	Majo	r	б
28-55 56-83	0 1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2 C 0		Cor	neral					0	IIndo	. ~		0	Mon	mo i ox	2
84-150	3	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0 1	D 0		Ger	ier.gl	-				U	Under	gr	au	8	MO11-	major	۷
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	Б 0 F 0	Electives							0	####	_ 1	leans t	here =	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	5	P 0	FIECCIVES							U			es to b			_	11
				I O		Oth	ner					7	T CDD(- 519II	Cai		
				? 0		0.01						-							

Course-Section: MUSC 225 0101 University of Maryland Title THEORY III: COUNTERPOIN Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 26

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1182

Job IRBR3029

		1					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	1	2	5	7	11	3.96	1183/1639	4.48	4.66	4.27	4.35	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	5	13	4.04	1067/1639	4.19	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	16	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1397	4.88	4.72	4.28	4.39	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	548/1583	4.73	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	4	3	8	6	3.52	1229/1532	3.93	4.40	4.01	4.09	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	0	1	5	13	4.45	441/1504	4.73	4.23	4.05	4.09	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	2	4	4	5	7	3.50	1399/1612	3.75	4.36	4.16	4.21	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	721/1635		4.54	4.65	4.63	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	5	9	4	3.84	1102/1579	4.09	4.55	4.08	4.14	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.70	4.43	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	1352/1520	4.63	4.85	4.70	4.78	4.27
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	3	1	5	6	3.93	1152/1517	4.30	4.65	4.27	4.34	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	1	7	5	4.00	1077/1550	4.33	4.60	4.22	4.33	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	858/1295	4.36	4.45	3.94	4.07	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	Ο	2	1	6	3.82	924/1398	4.41	4.25	4.07	4.14	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	983/1391	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	821/1388	4.64	4.42	4.28	4.37	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	15	8	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	4.00	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	26	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 225 0201 University of Maryland Title THEORY III: COUNTERPOIN Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1183

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	S		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	0	3	5.00	1/1639	4.48	4.66	4.27	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	774/1639	4.19	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	4.88	4.72	4.28	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	4.73	4.67	4.19	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	506/1532	3.93	4.40	4.01	4.09	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	4.73	4.23	4.05	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1044/1612	3.75	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0		1497/1635		4.54	4.65	4.63	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	569/1579	4.09	4.55	4.08	4.14	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.70	4.43	4.48	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.63	4.85	4.70	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	405/1517	4.30	4.65	4.27	4.34	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1550	4.33	4.60	4.22	4.33	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1295	4.36	4.45	3.94	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	4.41	4.25	4.07	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	4.50	4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388		4.42	4.28	4.37	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 227 0101 University of Maryland Title THRY V:20TH CENT MUS A Baltimore County

Instructor: BOYD, MICHAEL Enrollment: 15

Ouestionnaires: 15

Fall 2007 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1184

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 4 11 4.73 342/1639 4.73 4.66 4.27 4.35 4.73 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 13 4.73 273/1639 4.73 4.62 4.22 4.27 4.73 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 1 13 4.73 302/1397 4.73 4.72 4.28 4.39 4.73 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 0 0 2 12 4.60 371/1583 4.60 4.67 4.19 4.28 4.60 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 2 10 4.47 377/1532 4.47 4.40 4.01 4.09 4.47 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 3 11 4.60 291/1504 4.60 4.23 4.05 4.09 4.60 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 3 12 4.80 166/1612 4.80 4.36 4.16 4.21 4.80 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 8 7 4.47 1175/1635 4.47 4.54 4.65 4.63 4.47 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 7 4 4.36 538/1579 4.36 4.55 4.08 4.14 4.36 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 5 0 0 0 0 8 4.80 360/1518 4.80 4.70 4.43 4.48 4.80 2 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 5 0 0 0 0 2 8 4.80 802/1520 4.80 4.85 4.70 4.78 4.80 5 0 0 1 0 2 7 4.50 597/1517 4.50 4.65 4.27 4.34 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 522/1550 4.60 4.60 4.22 4.33 4.60 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 0 1 0 2 1 6 4.10 577/1295 4.10 4.45 3.94 4.07 4.10 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 2 1 3 4.17 695/1398 4.17 4.25 4.07 4.14 4.17 4 2 4.33 752/1391 4.33 4.36 4.30 4.35 4.33 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 647/1388 4.50 4.42 4.28 4.37 4.50 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 307/ 958 4.33 4.18 3.93 4.00 4.33

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 230 0101 University of Maryland MUSICS OF THE WORLD Baltimore County HUANG, YI-PING

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

41

Fall 2007

Page 1185

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	17	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Quescionnaires.	1 /	bludent	COULSE	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		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 Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	379/1639	4.71	4.66	4.27	4.35	4.71
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	3	11		567/1639	4.47	4.62	4.22	4.27	4.47
		estions reflec			0	1	0	0	4	1	11	4.44			4.72	4.28	4.39	4.44
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	2	0	3	1	11	4.12			4.67	4.19	4.28	4.12
				what you learned	0	3	1	3	2	1	7	3.71	1092/1532		4.40	4.01	4.09	3.71
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	1	8	3.71	1092/1504	3.71	4.23	4.05	4.09	3.71
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	0	1	4	2	9	4.19	892/1612	4.19	4.36	4.16	4.21	4.19
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	7	3	7	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.63	4.00
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.55	4.08	4.14	4.20
1 Were th	he instri	Lectur actor's lecture		nrenared	2	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.53	770/1518	4.53	4.70	4.43	4.48	4.53
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	925/1520	4.73	4.85	4.70	4.78	4.73
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.65	4.27	4.34	4.67
		es contribute t		2	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.60	4.22	4.33	4.67	
				our understanding	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	197/1295			3.94	4.07	4.64
		-	-	3														
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	13	0	0	2	0	0	2		****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	4.14	***
				d to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.35	***
		_		d open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/1388		4.42	4.28	4.37	***
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		13	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	4.00	****
				Frequ	iencs	, Dist	trib	ıtioı	n									
				11040	aciic y	DID	C1 1D(20101										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	рe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 12							ed fo	or Ma	ior		9	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55	1	В 2			1			- 5	_	-		_	-	5 -	_	-		
56-83							neral	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0	Other						3							
				? 1	001101													

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101 University of Maryland Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS Baltimore County Fall 2007

LADD, GITA (Instr. A)

Instructor: Enrollment: 2.3

Ouestionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1186 FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 1 7 4.67 430/1639 4.68 4.66 4.27 4.28 4.67 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 0 8 4.78 231/1639 4.85 4.62 4.22 4.20 4.78 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1583 4.50 4.67 4.19 4.24 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 7 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/1612 4.50 4.36 4.16 4.12 **** 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 4 4 4.50 1135/1635 4.52 4.54 4.65 4.66 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 0 0 0 2 1 4.33 569/1579 4.73 4.55 4.08 4.07 4.67 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 1 5.00 ****/1518 **** 4.70 4.43 4.39 **** 8 0 0 0 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1520 **** 4.85 4.70 4.68 **** 8 0 0 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 8 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1517 **** 4.65 4.27 4.23 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 5.00 ****/1398 **** 4.25 4.07 4.13 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1391 **** 4.36 4.30 4.35 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1388 **** 4.42 4.28 4.34 **** 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 958 **** 4.18 3.93 3.97 **** 4. Were special techniques successful Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.78 4.45 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 43 **** 4.69 4.69 5.00 ****

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

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101 University of Maryland Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: BUSCHEK, KIMBER (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2007

Page 1187

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	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	1	1	7	4.67	430/1639	4.68	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	231/1639	4.85	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1583	4.50	4.67	4.19	4.24	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.12	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1135/1635	4.52	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1579	4.73	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	4.13	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.35	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.34	****
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	***	4.18	3.93	3.97	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.78	4.45	5.00	* * * *
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.69	4.69	5.00	****

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 301	0101	University o	f Maryland	Pag	је 1	L188
Title	CHAMBERS	PLAYERS	Baltimore	County	FEB 13	3, 2	2008
Instructor:	RICHARDS,	MICHA	Fall	2007	Job IF	RBR3	3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Тi Ins Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 7

			Frequencies					Instructor			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	0	6	4.71	366/1639	4.68	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	4.85	4.62	4.22	4.20	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.72	4.28	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1087/1635	4.52	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	122/1579	4.73	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.86
Lecture														

5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1295 **** 4.45 3.94 3.95 ****

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	7	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 303 0101 University of Maryland Title MD CAMERATA--CHAMBER C Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: SMITH, DAVID

4. Were special techniques successful

Enrollment: 42 Ouestionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1189

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

0 1 0 3 4.50 ****/ 958 **** 4.18 3.93 3.97 ****

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 3 22 4.88 188/1639 4.88 4.66 4.27 4.28 4.88 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 22 4.88 142/1639 4.88 4.62 4.22 4.20 4.88 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 18 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 196/1397 4.86 4.72 4.28 4.26 4.86 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 15 0 0 0 2 8 4.80 186/1583 4.80 4.67 4.19 4.24 4.80 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 20 0 0 1 3 4.75 ****/1532 **** 4.40 4.01 4.05 **** 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 23 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/1504 **** 4.23 4.05 4.12 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 11 1 0 0 2 11 4.57 418/1612 4.57 4.36 4.16 4.12 4.57 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 19 5 4.21 1390/1635 4.21 4.54 4.65 4.66 4.21 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 0 0 2 18 4.90 108/1579 4.90 4.55 4.08 4.07 4.90 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 13 0 0 Ω 0 1 11 4.92 191/1518 4.92 4.70 4.43 4.39 4.92 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 13 0 0 0 0 1 11 4.92 491/1520 4.92 4.85 4.70 4.68 4.92 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 157/1517 4.91 4.65 4.27 4.23 4.91 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 174/1550 4.91 4.60 4.22 4.20 4.91 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 12 5 1 0 2 1 4 3.88 753/1295 3.88 4.45 3.94 3.95 3.88 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 18 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1398 5.00 4.25 4.07 4.13 5.00 7 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 18 0 0 0 0 0 1/1391 5.00 4.36 4.30 4.35 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 18 0 0 0 1 1 5 4.57 593/1388 4.57 4.42 4.28 4.34 4.57

18 3 0 0 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 А	22	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	13	Under-grad	25	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 304 0101 University of Maryland
Title UMBC JUBILEE SINGERS Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE

Enrollment: 42
Questionnaires: 18

Page 1190 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------------------	---------------

							Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	14	4.56	561/1639	4.56	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.56
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	89/1639	4.94	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.94
		estions reflect			1	8	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.26	5.00
		uations reflect			1	7	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00
		eadings contribu			0	8	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	276/1532	4.60	4.40	4.01	4.05	4.60
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	ibute to	what you learned	0	14	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	4.12	****
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	explain	ed	0	5	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	996/1612	4.08	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.08
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	1	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1094/1635	4.56	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.56
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overal	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.50
	Lecture																	
		actor's lectures	_	-	6 6	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1518		4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1517		4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques enh	nance you	r understanding	7	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.95	****
		Discuss																
		ussions contribu		-	11	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.00
		nts actively end			11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00
		ctor encourage f		open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1388	4.86	4.42	4.28	4.34	4.86
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	sstul		11	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****
		Field V									_		50				4 =0	
		rience contribut			17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	4.78	****
_	-	y understand you ctor available f			17 17	0	0	0	0	0 1	U T	5.00	****/ 53 ****/ 42	****	3.50	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the	e instruc	ctor available i	or consu	Itation	1/	U	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	^^^^/ 42	***	4.83	4.75	4.63	* * * *
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 16					Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	s	2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	2
28-55																		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				8	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	16
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0						Electives 2 #### - Means the							_	јh				
P 0													respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
I 0						Ot1	ner					4						
? 0																		

Course-Section: MUSC 305 0101

Title UMBC COMMUNITY SYMPHON

Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA

Enrollment: 34
Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1191 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	(Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera																	
1 Di	id vou a	ain ne	Genera. w insights,skil	_	m this source	1	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	404/16	3 0	4.69	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.69
			tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	10	22	4.69	327/16		4.69	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.69
			estions reflect			2	28	0	0	0	0	3		****/13		****	4.72	4.28	4.26	****
		_	ations reflect		_	2	25	0	0	0	3	3		****/15		****	4.67	4.19	4.24	****
					what you learned	3	26	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/15		****	4.40	4.01	4.05	****
					o what you learned	2	29	0	0	0	0	2		****/15		****	4.23	4.05	4.12	****
			system clearly			2	6	0	1	2	5	17		469/16		4.52	4.36	4.16		4.52
			was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72			4.72	4.54	4.65		4.72
					hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	75/15	79	4.94	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.94
			Lecture	9																
1. We	ere the	instru	ctor's lectures	s well	prepared	17	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	257/15	18	4.88	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.88
2. Di	id the i	nstruc	tor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	17	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/15	20	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Wa	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					18	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	110/15	17	4.93	4.65	4.27	4.23	4.93
4. Di	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					17	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	435/15	50	4.69	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.69
5. Di	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						7	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	243/12	95	4.56	4.45	3.94	3.95	4.56
			Discus	sion																
					what you learned	23	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	426/13	98	4.50	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.50
2. ₩∈	ere all	studer	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	22	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	655/13	91	4.45	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.45
					d open discussion	22	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55			4.55	4.42	4.28	4.34	4.55
4. W∈	ere spec	ial te	echniques succes	ssful		20	5	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/ 9	58	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****
			Laborat	-																
2. W∈	ere you	provid	led with adequat	e back	ground information	31	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 2	40	****	1.00	4.11	4.08	****
			Field V																	
		_			hat you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	,	52	****	3.50	4.04	4.78	****
2. Di	id you c	learly	understand you	ır eval	uation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	53	****	3.50	4.05	4.31	****
			Self I																	
1. Di	id self-	paced	system contribu	ite to	what you learned	31	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/	50	****	4.78	4.45	5.00	****
	Fr						Dist	trib	utior	ı										
Credi	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons	3				Гуре	e			Majors	
00-2	00-27 4 0.00-0.99 1 A 26						Red	านว่า	ed fo	 or Ma	 aior		0	 Gradu			0	 Majo	 r	12
	28-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 1						1000	2411	- L	J_ 1·10	~ J U L	~	•	GIGGG	~~~		•	1100	-	
	56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	nera	1				9	Under	-ara	ad 3	13	Non-	major	21
	84-150 5 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					General					y onder-			i giaa 55		2.021				
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 9 F 0					Electives					4 #### - Means there are not enough				h						
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 9 F 0						FICCCIACD							responses to be significant							

Other

I 0

12

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 1192

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

DITE OTTINCITE.	ě .		
Questionnaires:	6	Student Course Eva	luation Questionnaire

		Frequencies				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	Λ	0	0	Λ	6	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00
	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.83	177/1639		4.62	4.22	4.20	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	-	-	0	0	0	Τ	5		,					
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	Ü	0	0	U	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1532	****	4.40	4.01	4.05	* * * *
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	4.12	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	n	0	3	2	4.40	496/1579		4.55	4.08	4.07	4.40
J. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		U	U	U	U	5	2	1.10	400/10/9	1.10	1.33	1.00	1.07	1.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00
	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	U	0	0	-	U	_		,					
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding			0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.95	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 307A 0101 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE

Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS

Enrollment: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 307F 0101

4

SMALL ENSEMBLE GOLDSTEIN, THOM

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

Fall 2007

Page 1193 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Instructor		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	0	4	4.60	508/1639	4.60	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	415/1639	4.60	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	718/1612	4.33	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1235/1635	4.40	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ss 0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1 Ways the improvements lastrones well more and	2	0	Λ	Λ	1	Λ	1	4 00	1007/1510	4 00	4 70	1 12	4 20	4 00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00 1237/1518	4.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50 1188/1520	4.50	4.85	4.70	4.68	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50 597/1517	4.50	4.65	4.27	4.23	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00 1077/1550	4.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/1295	****	4.45	3.94	3.95	****
Discussion													

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1398 **** 4.25 4.07 4.13 **** 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1391 **** 4.36 4.30 4.35 **** 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1388 **** 4.42 4.28 4.34 ****

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 307G 0101 SMALL ENSEMBLE FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 MORIN, JOSEPH 9

Page 1194

Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
	Course	Course Evaluation

?

0

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	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 yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.83
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	5.00
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.26	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	4.05	5.00
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1504	****	4.23	4.05	4.12	****
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.12	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.95	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	4.13	***
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.35	***
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	****	4.42	4.28	4.34	****
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful	_	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	Tarned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pe:	asons	2			Ту	ne			Majors	2
										, 								
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 0									1					_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera:	L				2	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0											,			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		E10	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſΠ
				P 0								-	respons	es to k	e sign	ııııcan	ιτ	
				I 0		Ot.	her					1						

Course-Section	n: MUSC 307L 0101	University of Maryland	Pag
Title	COLLABORATIVE PIANO	Baltimore County	FEB 13
T	DD 33000 TAL DA GUD	E-11 000F	T - 1- TT

Page 1195 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE Fall 2007

Questionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Enrollment:

3

	Frequencies				Instructor			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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1321/1391	3.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.18	3.93	3.97	4.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1 #### - Means there		are not enough	1	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	0						

Baltimore County

Page 1196

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: MUSC 308 0101 University of Maryland Title UMBC WIND ENSEMBLE Instructor: VILLANUEVA, JAR Fall 2007

Enrollment:	33				
Questionnaires:	19	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire

								_	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	_		Level	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	2	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	656/1639	4.47	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.47
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	142/1639	4.89	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.89
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.26	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	12	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	4.05	5.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	2	8	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1612	4.89	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.89
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1045/1635	4.63	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.63
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00
		ctor seem inter			7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.86
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	6	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	100/1295	4.83	4.45	3.94	3.95	4.83
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	708/1398	4.14	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.14
				ed to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	12	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	593/1388	4.57	4.42	4.28	4.34	4.57
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful	_	12	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	2			Ту	ne			Majors	
										, 								
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 16		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	в 0				_										
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Gei	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		_						_			_			_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				3	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ıficar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					2						
				3 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2007

Page 1197 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	5	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: MUSC 313 0101

9

ADVANCED GAMELAN

BECK, GINA C

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

						Fr	eque:	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 ne	ew insights,skills fr	rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	257/1639	4.80	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.80
2. Did the	instruc	ctor make clear the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	199/1639	4.80	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.80
3. Did the	exam qu	uestions reflect the	expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.26	5.00
4. Did oth	er evalı	uations reflect the ϵ	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.60
5. Did ass	igned re	eadings contribute to	what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	4.05	5.00
6. Did wri	tten ass	signments contribute	to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was the	grading	g system clearly expl	ained	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	814/1612	4.25	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.25
8. How many	y times	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How wou	ld you g	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.50
		Lecture															
1. Were the	e instru	uctor's lectures well	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1518	****	4.70	4.43	4.39	****
2. Did the	instruc	ctor seem interested	in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.85	4.70	4.68	****
3. Was lec	ture mat	terial presented and	explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1517	****	4.65	4.27	4.23	****
		es contribute to what	-	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1550	****	4.60	4.22	4.20	****
		Discussion															
1. Did cla	ss discu	ussions contribute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	****	4.25	4.07	4.13	****
		nts actively encourage	-	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.36	4.30	4.35	****
		ctor encourage fair a		4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	***	4.42	4.28	4.34	****
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea:	rned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4		Red		ed f	or Ma	aior:	 s	1	 Graduat	 e		Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	В 0			-1				-	_	CIGGGG	-	-		_	•

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

Course-Section: MUSC 315 0101 University of Maryland ALEXANDER TECHNIQUE

Title Baltimore County Instructor: SALKIND, WENDY Fall 2007

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 7 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestions			MD	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_	UMBC Mean	Level	Sect Mean
		Quescions													Mean		Mean	Mean
		General																
		ew insights,skil			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639		4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00
		ctor make clear	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	295/1639		4.62	4.22	4.20	4.71
		lestions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57			4.72	4.28	4.26	4.57
		uations reflect	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.71	- ,		4.67	4.19	4.24	4.71
	_	eadings contribu		at you learned what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2		4.43	- ,		4.40	4.01	4.05 4.12	4.43 4.57
		g system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	1	2		4.57	,		4.23	4.05	4.12	4.57
		was class cance	-	eu	0	0	0	0	0	4	_		1215/1635		4.54	4.16	4.12	4.43
	-			ng effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	6				4.55	4.03	4.00	
J. How would	ia you s	grade the overar	i ccaciii	ng criccerveness	O	O	O	Ü	U	_	O	1.00	122/13/7	1.00	1.55	1.00	1.07	1.00
		Lecture																
		uctor's lectures	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1518		4.70	4.43	4.39	4.86
		ctor seem intere		-	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00
		terial presented			1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517		4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1550		4.60		4.20	5.00
5. Did aud	iovisual	l techniques enh	ance you	r understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.95	5.00
		Discuss	ion															
1 Did clas	ss disci	ussions contribu		at vou learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1398	4.80	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.80
		nts actively enc			2	0	0	0	0	1		4.80	332/1391		4.36	4.30	4.35	4.80
		ctor encourage f			3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388		4.42	4.28	4.34	4.75
		echniques succes		-1	3	1	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 958		4.18		3.97	
_		-																
		Seminar																
		topics relevant			6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the	instruc	ctor available f	or indiv	idual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.59	****
		Field W	ork															
1. Did fie	ld exper	rience contribut		t you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.50	4.04	4.78	****
				_		- ·	.,											
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	ribi	utioi	1									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	1			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 2		Rec	านา่า	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 2					10	. ,	-	-	or adda c	-	-		-	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 1									respons					
				I 0		Oth	ner					0	-					
				? 0														

Page 1198

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: MUSC 318 0101 University of Maryland
Title DIGITAL AUDIO PROCESSI Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1199

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			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	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	293/1639	4.78	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	774/1639	4.33	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	467/1397	4.56	4.72	4.28	4.26	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	355/1583	4.63	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	1	2	0	0	3	3.33	1330/1532	3.33	4.40	4.01	4.05	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	965/1612	4.11	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	706/1635	4.88	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	2	0	0	4	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.65	4.27	4.23	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	253/1550	4.83	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	623/1295	4.00	4.45	3.94	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	Ο	Ο	5	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	863/1391	4.20	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 958	****	4.18	3.93	3.97	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 321 0101
Title MUSIC HISTORY I
Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH

27

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1200 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	eque	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	8	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	656/1639	4.47	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	327/1639	4.68	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	250/1397	4.79	4.72	4.28	4.26	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	2	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	871/1583	4.18	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	692/1532	4.11	4.40	4.01	4.05	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	3	3	1	1	3	8	3.75	1051/1504	3.75	4.23	4.05	4.12	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	743/1612	4.32	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	855/1635	4.78	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	783/1579	4.14	4.55	4.08	4.07	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	849/1518	4.47	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	979/1520		4.85	4.70	4.68	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	843/1517		4.65	4.27	4.23	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	414/1550	4.71	4.60	4.22	4.20	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	513/1295	4.19	4.45	3.94	3.95	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	916/1398	3.83	4.25	4.07	4.13	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	945/1391		4.36	4.30	4.35	4.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	923/1388	4.08	4.42	4.28	4.34	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	15	7	0	0	0	2	3		****/ 958		4.18	3.93	3.97	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7		Red	 auire	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	 :s	 1	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 r	12

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 360 0101

Title SEM:K-12 CHORAL METHOD

Instructor: SMITH, DAVID

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007

Page 1201 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Cou	rse	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mea	an	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	231/163	9 4.	33	4.66	4.27	4.28	4.83
2. Did th	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	177/163	9 4.	33	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.83
		estions reflect			1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/139			4.72	4.28	4.26	****
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/158	3 4.	57	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.67
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/153			4.40	4.01	4.05	4.83
				to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.67				4.23	4.05	4.12	4.67
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	490/161			4.36	4.16	4.12	4.50
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	1	3	2		1415/163			4.54	4.65	4.66	4.17
	-			ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/157			4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00
		Lecture	e																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	684/151	8 4.	50	4.70	4.43	4.39	4.60
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/152			4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	239/151			4.65	4.27	4.23	4.80
		s contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/155			4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00
				your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	185/129			4.45	3.94	3.95	4.67
5. Did au	ulovisuai	ceciniiques em	nance y	our understanding	1	۷	U	U	U	1	4	4.07	105/125	J 4.	5 /	4.45	3.94	3.93	4.07
ו הלים ו		Discus			2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1 /1 2 0	8 5.	20	4.25	4.07	4 12	г оо
				what you learned	3	0	0	0	•	0	3		1/139					4.13	5.00
		_	_	ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	-	-	5.00	1/139			4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00
		_		nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/138			4.42	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssiul		3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 95	8 4.	50	4.18	3.93	3.97	4.50
		Semina								•							4 = 0		
				announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00		5 5.0		5.00	4.58	4.50	5.00
				lividual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1			2 **		****	4.52	4.59	****
	_	-		what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00		8 5.		5.00	4.47	4.60	5.00
		ns contribute			5	0	0	0	0	0	1		, -	0 **		****	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	e clear	-	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 8	2 **	* *	****	4.16	4.08	****
		Field V			_						_								
1. Did fi	eld exper	ience contribu	te to v	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 5	2 **	**	3.50	4.04	4.78	****
		Self																	
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 5	0 **	* *	4.78	4.45	5.00	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	1										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				T	уре				Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 5					or Ma			0	 Gradua			 0	 Majo		4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		re(4utt (=u 1(JI Ma	JOTS		U	Gradua	LE		U	Ma JC) _	4
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Cos	nera:	1				0	Under-	arad		6	Non	-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-2.99	1	D 0		Gel	ici d.	L				U	onder -	grau		U	MOII-	ilia JUL	۷
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	Б 0 F 0		יום.	ectiv	700				0	####	Mean	- +1	hara -	re not	enoug	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	ے	P 0		г. т. (=CLT,	v C S				U	respon					_	111
				I O		O+1	ner					5	respon	oco L	יע	e praii	ııııdı	10	
				1 0		OCI	iet.					J							

Course-Section: MUSC 361 0101 University of Maryland Title SEM:K-12 INSTRU METHOD Baltimore County

Fall 2007 Instructor: VANDERBEEK, MAX

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

- · ·			A
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

Page 1202

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque:	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:	 L															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls from	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did	the instru	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.67
3. Did	the exam q	uestions reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.72	4.28	4.26	4.67
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1583	4.67	4.67	4.19	4.24	4.67
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contribu	ite to i	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.40	4.01	4.05	4.33
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	544/1504	4.33	4.23	4.05	4.12	4.33
7. Was	the grading	g system clearly	expla:	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.67
8. How	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1288/1635	4.33	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.33
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00
		Lecture	_															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00
		ctor seem inter	-		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1295				3.95	5.00
1 5 1		Discus			-	0	•	0	0	_	_	F 00	1 /1200	F 00	4 05	4 05	4 10	F 00
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1398	5.00		4.07	4.13	5.00
				d to participate	1	0	0	-	0	0		5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00
		_		d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were	special t	echniques succes	ssiul		1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.18	3.93	3.97	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Per	 mir		or Ma	ior	 z	0	Graduat		0	Majo		3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		1000	4411	Ju I	OI MC	. , О	3	U	Gradact	_	0	Maje	, <u> </u>	5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad	3	Non-	major	0
84-150		3.00-3.49	0	D 0		001	a.	_				-	011401 9		-	2.011		ŭ
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-	2.22 2.30	_	P 0								-	respons				_	•
				I O		Ot.h	ner					3					-	
				? 0								-						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 362 0101

4

ARTS IN EDUCATION

YOSHIOKA, AIRI

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 1203

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	ഷാല	ncies	2		Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	IIMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		General															
1 Did vo	u dain ne	w insights, skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00
		tor make clear the		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639		4.62	4.22	4.20	5.00
		ations reflect the		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583		4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00
		adings contribute t		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532		4.40	4.01	4.05	5.00
			to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504		4.23	4.05	4.12	5.00
		system clearly exp		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612		4.36	4.16	4.12	5.00
		was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	1		1135/1635		4.54	4.65	4.66	4.50
			aching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579		4.55	4.08		5.00
		Lecture															
1. Were ti	he instru	ctor's lectures wel	l prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00
		tor seem interested		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520		4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00
		erial presented and		1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1517		4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00
		s contribute to wha		1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00
		techniques enhance		1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1273/1295	2.00	4.45	3.94	3.95	2.00
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.00
		ts actively encoura		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	5.00
		tor encourage fair		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.34	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques successful	-	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.18	3.93	3.97	4.00
		Field Work															
1. Did fi	eld exper	ience contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	3.50	4.04	4.78	5.00
2. Did yo	u clearly	understand your ev	aluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	3.50	4.05	4.31	5.00
3. Was th	e instruc	tor available for c	onsultation	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 42	4.50	4.83	4.75	4.63	4.50
4. To wha	t degree	could you discuss y	our evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.52	5.00
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry out	field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	4.33	4.56	4.30	5.00
			Frequ	iency	Dis	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	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	в 0			-			_						,		

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 380 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO CONDUCTING Baltimore County

Instructor: LOVE, JASON

Enrollment: 22
Ouestionnaires: 22

Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1204

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 6 0 0 8 4.31 832/1639 4.31 4.66 4.27 4.28 4.31 6 0 0 1 5 2 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 8 4.06 1044/1639 4.06 4.62 4.22 4.20 4.06 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 7 1 0 0 1 5 8 4.50 517/1397 4.50 4.72 4.28 4.26 4.50 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 6 1 0 1 2 3 9 4.33 697/1583 4.33 4.67 4.19 4.24 4.335. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6 10 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 506/1532 4.33 4.40 4.01 4.05 4.33 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6 4 1 0 3 1 7 4.08 780/1504 4.08 4.23 4.05 4.12 4.08 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 7 2 3 1 1 3 5 3.46 1415/1612 3.46 4.36 4.16 4.12 3.46 8. How many times was class cancelled 6 0 0 0 0 10 6 4.38 1257/1635 4.38 4.54 4.65 4.66 4.38 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0 1 8 5 4.29 623/1579 4.29 4.55 4.08 4.07 4.29 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 14 0 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 978/1518 4.38 4.70 4.43 4.39 4.38 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 14 0 0 0 0 0 8 5.00 1/1520 5.00 4.85 4.70 4.68 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 14 0 0 0 2 1 5 4.38 758/1517 4.38 4.65 4.27 4.23 4.38 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 1 0 1 6 4.50 638/1550 4.50 4.60 4.22 4.20 4.50 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 15 2 0 0 1 0 4 4.60 ****/1295 **** 4.45 3.94 3.95 **** Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 0 1 2 3 4.00 770/1398 4.00 4.25 4.07 4.13 4.00 15 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 279/1391 4.86 4.36 4.30 4.35 4.86 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 0 0 2 3 2 4.00 944/1388 4.00 4.42 4.28 4.34 4.00 4. Were special techniques successful 15 3 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 ****/ 958 **** 4.18 3.93 3.97 **** Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Α	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section	n: MUSC 390B 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1205
Title	VOICE	Baltimore County	FEB 13, 2008
Inatruator:	מדוזות בידותים	E-11 2007	Tob TDDD2020

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title VOICE Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: SMITH, DAVID Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

		Frequencies		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	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				2	Λ						

Course-Section	n: MUSC 390C 0101	University of Maryland	Page
Title	VIOLIN	Baltimore County	FEB 13,
T	VOCITORA ATDT	E-11 2007	Tale IDDI

ge 1206 3, 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI Fall 2007 Enrollment: 1

Ouestionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Frequencies			3			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	1	0	0	0	2.00	1637/1639	2.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1639/1639	1.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	1.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1363/1397	3.00	4.72	4.28	4.26	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1595/1612	2.00	4.36	4.16	4.12	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1398/1398	1.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	1.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1385/1391	2.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	2.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1383/1388	2.00	4.42	4.28	4.34	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	937/ 958	2.00	4.18	3.93	3.97	2.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section	n: MUSC 390F 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1207
Title	ELECTRIC GUITAR	Baltimore County	FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:	LAGANA, THOMAS	Fall 2007	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	4		

Questionnaires:	2	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00
Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_	_		
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 390G 0101
Title CLASSICAL GUITAR
Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2007 Page 1208 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
---------	--------	--------------------	---------------

			Frequencies					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	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.23	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.36	4.30	4.35	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.34	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	ed Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons					Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
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	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 390K 0101 University of Maryland Page 1209
Title CLARINET Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	2	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Instr	uctor	Course Dept		ot 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	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.20	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.40	4.01	4.05	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.07	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	0						

Course-Section	: MUSC 400 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1210
Title	SPECIAL PROJECTS	Baltimore County	FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:	KIMBOYLE, DAVID	Fall 2007	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	3		

Enrollment:	3				
Questionnaires:	1	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Frequencies						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	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.29	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.21	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	 Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-		-	
				2	0						

Course-Section:	MUSC 401 0101		University o	f Maryland	Page 1211
Title	SPECIAL PROJECTS: C	COMP	Baltimore	County	FEB 13, 2008
Instructor:	SMITH, STUART (In	nstr. A)	Fall	2007	Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SMITH, STUART (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Frequencies				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	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.62	4.22	4.29	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.40	4.01	4.07	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.72	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons	Type			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	 Major	1	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0	
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	1	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	1	-		-		
				2	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 401 0101 University of Maryland Page 1212 SPECIAL PROJECTS: COMP Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Title Instructor: KIM-BOYLE, DAVI (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Enrollment:	5	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Instructor			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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.62	4.22	4.29	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.40	4.01	4.07	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.21	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	es Reasons Type			Туре				Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1				
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0										
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0				
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	ı				
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant					
				I	0	Other	1								
				?	0										

Course-Section: MUSC 417 0101 University of Maryland Page 1213 Title Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 SPEC TPCS IN MUSC TECH Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies			Instructor		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 yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.66	4.27	4.42	4.75
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.62	4.22	4.29	4.75
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.72	4.28	4.38	4.75
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	419/1532	4.43	4.40	4.01	4.07	4.43
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.23	4.05	4.20	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.18	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	205/1579	4.71	4.55	4.08	4.21	4.71
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.51	5.00
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.24	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	4.01	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.25	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.36	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.42	4.28	4.50	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful	_	2	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	4.18	3.93	4.24	4.75
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E		G GDA		The second of th				Da		_			m				Ma	_
E	arnea	Cum. GPA	· 	Expected Grades				ке:	asons	∍ 			Ту				Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1								_	_	_	_			_
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		Ger	nera	l				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ιh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

5

I

?

0

Course-Section	n: MUSC 418 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1214
Title	MUSIC TECH. INTERNSHIP	Baltimore County	FEB 13, 2008
T	MINDOM DAMED	E-11 000F	T-1- TDDD 2000

Job IRBR3029 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID Fall 2007

Enrollment:	4					
Ouestionnaires:	2		Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

	Frequencies							Instr	uctor	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	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.29	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.21	5.00

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Cum. GPA		d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: MUSC 690	8010	University of Maryland	Page 1215
Title SEM: AMER	R CHAMBER MUSI	Baltimore County	FEB 13, 2008

Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA (Instr. A) Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	7	
Ouestionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

		Frequencies						Instr	uctor	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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.81	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 690 8010 University of Maryland Page 1216 Title SEM: AMER CHAMBER MUSI Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: CELLA, LISA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	1 66	4.27	4.42	5.00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		,					
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	U	0	U	0	Т	5.00	1/1639		4.62	4.22	4.26	5.00
 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.72	4.28	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.23	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.45	3.94	3.95	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 693 8010 University of Maryland Title SOLO PERFORMANCE STUDY Baltimore County

Page 1217 FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM (Instr. A)

Enrollment:	7			
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

~							~											
						Fre	eque	ncie	S		Ins	tructo	r	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rar	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	gain ne	ew insights,skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the	instruc	ctor make clear the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1	1639	4.33	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.00
8. How man	y times	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1	1635	4.33	4.54	4.65	4.81	4.00
		Discussion																
1. Did cla	ss disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1271/1	1398	3.33	4.25	4.07	4.22	3.00
2. Were al	l studer	nts actively encourag	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1321/1	1391	3.33	4.36	4.30	4.47	3.00
3. Did the	instruc	ctor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1320/1	1388	3.67	4.42	4.28	4.49	3.00
4. Were sp	ecial te	echniques successful		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/	958	3.00	4.18	3.93	4.01	4.00
		Laboratory																
2. Were yo	u provid	ded with adequate bac	kground information	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	234/	240	1.00	1.00	4.11	3.96	1.00
		Field Work																
1. Did fie	ld exper	rience contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	32/	52	4.00	3.50	4.04	3.64	4.00
2. Did you	clearly	y understand your eva	luation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	31/	53	4.00	3.50	4.05	4.03	4.00
3. Was the	instruc	ctor available for co	nsultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	42	5.00	4.83	4.75	4.78	5.00
5. Did con	ferences	s help you carry out	field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/	32	4.00	4.33	4.56	4.59	4.00
		Self Paced																
1. Did sel	f-paced	system contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/	50	4.33	4.78	4.45	4.39	4.00
2. Did stu	dy quest	tions make clear the	expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	22/	32	4.00	4.40	4.51	4.50	4.00
3. Were yo	ur conta	acts with the instruc	tor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	37/	43	4.33	4.69	4.69	4.61	4.00
			Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S				Туј	pe			Majors	i
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 0		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 S	0	Grac	duat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	в 0															

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General 0		Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	-		
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 693 8010 University of Maryland SOLO PERFORMANCE STUDY Baltimore County

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

7

Title Instructor: CELLA, LISA (Instr. C) Fall 2007 Page 1218

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

				Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	 General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.33	4.62	4.22	4.26	4.00
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/163	4.33	4.54	4.65	4.81	4.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1271/1398	3.33	4.25	4.07	4.22	3.00
2. Were all students	s actively encourag	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1321/1393	3.33	4.36	4.30	4.47	3.00
3. Did the instruct	or encourage fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1320/1388	3.67	4.42	4.28	4.49	3.00
4. Were special tech	hniques successful	_	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 958	3.00	4.18	3.93	4.01	4.00
	Laboratory															
2. Were you provided	d with adequate bac	kground information	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	234/ 240	1.00	1.00	4.11	3.96	1.00
	Field Work															
1. Did field experie	ence contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	32/ 52	4.00	3.50	4.04	3.64	4.00
2. Did you clearly	understand your eva	luation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	31/ 53	3 4.00	3.50	4.05	4.03	4.00
3. Was the instruct	_		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 4:	2 5.00	4.83	4.75	4.78	5.00
5. Did conferences l	help you carry out	field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/ 32	4.00	4.33	4.56	4.59	4.00
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced s	ystem contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 50	4.33	4.78	4.45	4.39	4.00
2. Did study questi	ons make clear the	expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	22/ 32	4.00	4.40	4.51	4.50	4.00
3. Were your contact	ts with the instruc	tor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	37/ 43	3 4.33	4.69	4.69	4.61	4.00
		Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			T	⁄pe			Majors	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: MUSC 693 8010 University of Maryland Title SOLO PERFORMANCE STUDY Baltimore County Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE Fall 2007

University of Maryland Page 1219
Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008
Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

1

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ρ

I

?

0

0

						Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	k	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights, skills	from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	639	5.00	4.66	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear th	e expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	639	4.33	4.62	4.22	4.26	5.00
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect th	he expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	973/1	397	4.00	4.72	4.28	4.37	4.00
		uations reflect th		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	583	5.00	4.67	4.19	4.31	5.00
			to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1532/1	532	1.00	4.40	4.01	4.10	1.00
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contribu	te to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1499/1	504	1.00	4.23	4.05	4.29	1.00
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearly e	xplained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1519/1	612	3.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	3.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class cancelle	ed	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	635	4.33	4.54	4.65	4.81	5.00
			teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	579	5.00	4.55	4.08	4.17	5.00
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures w	ell prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1	518	5.00	4.70	4.43	4.49	5.00
		ctor seem interest		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1		4.50	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
			nd explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1		4.50	4.65	4.27	4.32	5.00
		es contribute to w	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1077/1		3.50	4.60	4.22	4.23	4.00
			ce your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1		5.00				5.00
		Discussio	n															
1 Did cl	ass disc		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	770/1	398	3.33	4.25	4.07	4.22	4.00
			raged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	983/1		3.33	4.36	4.30	4.47	4.00
			r and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1		3.67	4.42	4.28	4.49	5.00
		echniques successf	-	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	951/		3.00	4.18	3.93		1.00
		Self Pac	od.															
1 Did se	lf_naged		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	50	4.33	4.78	4.45	4.39	5.00
	_	tions make clear t	_	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.00	22/	32	4.00	4.40	4.45	4.50	4.00
		acts with the inst		0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/	43	4.33	4.69	4.69	4.61	5.00
_		ck/tutoring by pro	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	32		5.00	4.37	4.31	5.00
		ugh proctors for a	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	21		5.00		4.42	5.00
			Frequ	anas	, Die	trib	u+ i o	n										
			riedo	iency	DIS	CLID	ucio.	11										
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3				Тур	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 s	0	Grad	uate	=	1	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	В 0															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0			Gei	nera	1				0	Unde	r-gı	rad	0	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0												_			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	####	- 1	Means t	here a		_	ţh

Other