Course-Section: MUSC 101 1

Title Fundamentals Music Thr

Instructor: Richards, Kazuko

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1043 MAR 22, 2010 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. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	852/1509	4.17	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	9	8	4.19	922/1509	4.27	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	12	6	4.14	857/1287	4.35	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	0	3	10	4	3.89	1103/1459	4.08	4.64	4.22	4.11	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	4	12	2	3.74	1060/1406	3.97	4.45	4.09	4.02	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	0	5	7	2	3.60	1145/1384	3.86	4.45	4.11	3.98	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	3	11	5	3.81	1176/1489	4.13	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	583/1506	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	12	7	4.24	648/1463	4.11	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	3	2	3	1	2	2.73	1423/1438	3.70	4.66	4.46	4.44	2.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1381/1421	4.31	4.82	4.73	4.66	3.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	5	4	1	1	0	1.82	1406/1411	3.18	4.66	4.31	4.27	1.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	2	3	1	0	2.00	1396/1405	3.31	4.66	4.32	4.27	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	2	1	3	2	1	1	2.75	1179/1236	3.38	4.45	4.00	3.87	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1260	3.37	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1255	3.29	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1258		4.72	4.38	4.18	****

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 101 2

Fundamentals Music Thr

Title Instructor: Hawley JR, Thoma

Enrollment: 86 Questionnaires: 81

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1044 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	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			_									4 04		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	30	0	3	4	8	21	15		1288/1509	4.17	4.66	4.31	4.18	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	30	0	1	1	7	9	33	4.41	683/1509	4.27	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	30	1	0	0	2	11	37	4.70	326/1287	4.35	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	30	29	2	1	2	2	15	4.23	803/1459	4.08	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	31	9	3	1	10	9	18	3.93	909/1406	3.97	4.45	4.09	4.02	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	31	39	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	****/1384	3.86	4.45	4.11	3.98	****
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	30	1	1	0	6	4	39	4.60	341/1489	4.13	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	31	1	0	0	0	3	46	4.94	408/1506	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	37	1	1	1	13	17	11	3.84	1036/1463	4.11	4.49	4.09	4.02	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	32	0	0	2	4	16	27	4.39	950/1438	3.70	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	0	1	2	5	41	4.76	881/1421	4.31	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	32	0	0	2	7	12	28	4.35	799/1411	3.18	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	2	4	10	31	4.35	818/1405	3.31	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	35	19	2	1	6	6	12	3.93	752/1236	3.38	4.45	4.00	3.87	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	60	0	3	0	7	2	9	3.67	982/1260	3.37	4.57	4.14	3.95	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	60	0	5	0	6	4	6	3.29	1175/1255	3.29	4.75	4.33	4.15	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	60	0	1	0	6	5	9	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	60	17	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****
•														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	80	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	3.75	****
•														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	42	Required for Majors	2	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	34	Under-grad	81	Non-major	81
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	14	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	10	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 101 3

Fundamentals Music Thr

Title Instructor: Richards, Kazuko

Enrollment: 69 Questionnaires: 56

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1045 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Out and the se	M	3.7.3		-	ncie	s	-		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3		5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	0	6	17	27	4.42	698/1509	4.17	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	3	6	18	23	4.22	901/1509	4.27	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	9	18	22	4.22	811/1287	4.35	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	5	1	0	6	23	15	4.13	885/1459	4.08	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	9	18	21	4.25	587/1406	3.97	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	9	1	1	6	17	16	4.12	734/1384	3.86	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	3	8	22	16	3.98	1010/1489	4.13	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.98
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	3	46	4.94	408/1506	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	31	16	4.26	618/1463	4.11	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	4	7	10	14	3 97	1222/1438	3.70	4.66	4.46	4.44	3.97
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	2	4	5	23		1195/1421	4.31	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	2	5	11	10	6		1312/1411	3.18	4.66	4.31	4.27	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	0	4	4	4	14	9		1248/1405	3.31	4.66	4.32	4.27	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	8	4	2	6	6	8		1002/1236		4.45	4.00	3.87	3.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	42	0	3	2	4	1	4		1152/1260		4.57	4.14	3.95	3.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	1	0	5	0	7		****/1255	3.29	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	0	2	1	5	5		****/1258	4.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	43	1	2	1	5	2	2	3.08	****/ 873	***	4.59	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.48	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ıtio	n									

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	В	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	15	Under-grad	56	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 1

Title Musicianship Lab I

Instructor: Cella,Lisa M
Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1046 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### 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	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	953/1509	3.86	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	731/1509	4.24	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	337/1287	4.84	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	715/1459	4.43	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	423/1406	4.34	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	278/1384	4.15	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	2	7	3.88	1127/1489	4.03	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	1305/1506	4.34	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	750/1463	3.86	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	1032/1438	3.92	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	1084/1421	4.32	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	738/1411	4.13	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	634/1405	4.19	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	536/1236	4.03	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	370/1260	4.04	4.57	4.14	3.95	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	526/1255	4.16	4.75	4.33	4.15	4.57
		-	1	-	2	0	4		,			4.38		3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	333/ 873	4.25	4.59	4.03	3.89	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0 1 0	0	1 2 1	1 0 1	-	3.86	1033/1258	3.30	4.72	4.38	4.18	3.86

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	9	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
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 si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 1 Title

Musicianship Lab I Parent, James C.

Instructor: Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1047 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	7	Ω	2	1	4	1	1	2 78	1487/1509	3.86	4.66	4.31	4.18	2.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	0	4	2	2		1391/1509	4.24	4.69	4.26	4.25	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	6	0	0	0	1	2		****/1287		4.76	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	3	0	0	2	2	2		979/1459		4.64	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	7	0	1	0	٥	1		****/1406	4.34	4.45	4.09	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	4	1	0	1	2	1		1235/1384		4.45	4.11	3.98	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	2	0	2	3	0	2		1370/1489	4.03	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	7	1		1383/1506	4.34	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	2	3	1	1		1413/1463		4.49	4.09	4.02	2.88
or non-would fou grade one everall educating effectiveness	Ū	Ü	_	_		_	-	2.00	1113, 1103	3.00	1.17	1.05	1.02	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	3	2	1	1	1	2.38	1429/1438	3.92	4.66	4.46	4.44	2.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	1406/1421	4.32	4.82	4.73	4.66	3.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	1	1	3	3	0	3.00	1361/1411	4.13	4.66	4.31	4.27	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	4	2	0	3.00	1348/1405	4.19	4.66	4.32	4.27	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1042/1236	4.03	4.45	4.00	3.87	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1260	4.04	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1255	4.16	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1258	3.30	4.72	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	4.25	4.59	4.03	3.89	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	7
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 2 Title

Musicianship Lab I

Instructor: Cella,Lisa M

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1048 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	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	3	10	4.77	291/1509	3.86	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	93/1509	4.24	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1287	4.84	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1459	4.43	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	269/1406	4.34	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	278/1384	4.15	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	330/1489	4.03	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1177/1506		4.69	4.67	4.66	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	325/1463	3.86	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	3.92	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	4.32	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1411	4.13	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	4.19	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	4.03	4.45	4.00	3.87	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	4.04	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	4.16	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	3.30	4.72	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	4.25	4.59	4.03	3.89	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	=			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 2 Title

Musicianship Lab I

Instructor: Parent, James C.

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1049 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### 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	2	0	3	0	0	5	5	3.69	1325/1509	3.86	4.66	4.31	4.18	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	880/1509	4.24	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1287	4.84	4.76	4.30	4.24	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	586/1459	4.43	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	813/1406	4.34	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	807/1384	4.15	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	641/1489	4.03	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	832/1506	4.34	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	983/1463	3.86	4.49	4.09	4.02	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1203/1438	3.92	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	3	4		1234/1421	4.32	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	985/1411	4.13	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	896/1405	4.19	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	274/1236	4.03	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1045/1260	4.04	4.57	4.14	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	0	2		1054/1255	4.16	4.75	4.33	4.15	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	1	0		1244/1258	3.30	4.72	4.38	4.18	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 873	4.25	4.59	4.03	3.89	****
		_	-	•	=	_	_		,					

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	Α	11	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 1050 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	4	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	---	----------------	------------	---------------

Course-Section: MUSC 112 3

Music Repertoire

Yoshioka,Airi

6

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1509 5.00 4.66 4.31 4.18 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1509 5.00 4.66 4.31 4.18 5.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1287 5.00 4.66 4.22 4.17 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1459 5.00 4.66 4.22 4.17 5.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1406 5.00 4.76 4.22 4.17 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1406 5.00 4.45 4.09 4.02 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.66 4.11 3.98 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.50 4.17 4.20 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.50 4.57 4.10 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.66 4.25 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 5.00 1/1483 5.00 4.66 4.46 4.44 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.66 4.32 4.75 4.00 1/1421 5.00 4.66 4.32 4.75 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.66 4.32 4.77 5.00 9. Did the instructor seem interested and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.66 4.32 4.77 5.00 9. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.66 4.31 4.77 5.00 9. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.67 4.48 4.05 9. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.67 4.33 4.15 5.00 9. Masj lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Question	s		NR	NA	Fre 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/1509 5.00 4.66 4.31 4.18 5.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1509 5.00 4.66 4.31 4.18 5.00 3.01 did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1287 5.00 4.66 4.30 4.24 5.00 4.01 did there evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.67 4.30 4.24 5.00 4.01 did there evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.67 4.30 4.24 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.45 4.01 3.98 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.45 4.11 3.98 5.00 7.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 1 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.45 4.11 3.98 5.00 7.00 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 1 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.45 4.09 4.02 5.00 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Conora	 1															
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1509 5.00 4.69 4.26 4.25 5.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1287 5.00 4.76 4.30 4.24 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1287 5.00 4.64 4.22 4.11 5.00 5.01 do sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1405 5.00 4.45 4.09 4.02 5.00 6.01 dwritten assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1488 5.00 4.45 4.09 4.02 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1488 5.00 4.45 4.01 3.98 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1488 5.00 4.65 4.11 3.98 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1488 5.00 4.65 4.09 4.02 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 151/1463 4.75 4.99 4.09 4.02 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 5.00 1/1488 5.00 4.66 4.46 4.44 5.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	1 Did vo	u gain ne			m this course	Ο	0	0	Ο	Ο	Ο	4	5 00	1/1509	5 00	4 66	4 31	4 18	5 00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 0 3 3 5.00 1/1287 5.00 4.64 4.30 4.24 5.00 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 5.00 4.00 4						-	-	•	•	•	•	_		,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1459 5.00 4.64 4.22 4.11 5.00 6. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1406 5.00 4.65 4.10 4.02 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1848 5.00 4.65 4.11 3.98 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1849 5.00 4.65 4.17 4.20 5.00 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 5.00 1/1849 5.00 4.65 4.17 4.20 5.00 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 5.00 1/1840 4.75 4.49 4.09 4.02 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 5.00 1/1463 4.75 4.49 4.09 4.02 4.75 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 5.00 1/1463 5.00 4.66 4.46 4.47 5.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00								-			-	_		,					
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1406 5.00 4.45 4.09 4.02 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1384 5.00 4.45 4.11 3.98 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1384 5.00 4.50 4.17 4.20 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 1 1/1489 5.00 4.50 4.57 4.20 5.00 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 1258/1506 4.25 4.69 4.67 4.66 4.25 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 1 1/1488 5.00 4.66 4.46 4.44 5.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00		_			_									, -					
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 2 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1384 5.00 4.45 4.11 3.98 5.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.50 4.17 4.20 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 1258/1506 4.25 4.69 4.67 4.66 4.25 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 151/1463 4.75 4.49 4.09 4.02 4.75    Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1438 5.00 4.66 4.46 4.44 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.66 4.31 4.27 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00								0	0	0	0								
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.50 4.17 4.20 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.25 1258/1506 4.25 4.69 4.67 4.66 4.25 4.09 4.07 4.05 4.07 4.06 4.25 4.09 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07						0	2	0	0	0	0	2		1/1384			4.11	3.98	
8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 3 1 4.25 1258/1506 4.25 4.69 4.67 4.66 4.25 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 151/1463 4.75 4.49 4.09 4.02 4.75    Lecture   1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1438 5.00 4.66 4.46 4.44 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.66 4.31 4.27 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1411 5.00 4.66 4.32 4.27 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1405 5.00 4.66 4.32 4.27 5.00 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1236 5.00 4.45 4.00 3.87 5.00 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1236 5.00 4.57 4.14 3.95 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.57 4.13 3.95 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.75 4.33 4.15 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.75 4.33 4.15 5.00 4.66 4.31 4.27 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.0			_		-		1	0	0	0	0	3		,					
How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   0   0   0   0   0   1   3   4.75   151/1463   4.75   4.49   4.09   4.02   4.75							0	0	0	0	3	1		,					
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1438 5.00 4.66 4.46 4.44 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.82 4.73 4.66 5.00 3.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4					hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		,					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1438 5.00 4.66 4.46 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.82 4.73 4.66 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00		2	,		J														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.82 4.73 4.66 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1411 5.00 4.66 4.31 4.27 5.00 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1236 5.00 4.66 4.31 4.27 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1236 5.00 4.66 4.32 4.75 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1236 5.00 4.75 4.00 3.87 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.0				_															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1411 5.00 4.66 4.31 4.27 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1405 5.00 4.66 4.32 4.27 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1236 5.00 4.45 4.00 3.87 5.00    Discussion  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1236 5.00 4.57 4.14 3.95 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.57 4.13 3.95 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.75 4.33 4.15 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.18 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 873 5.00 4.59 4.03 3.89 5.00    Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 1 0.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0							-	-		-	0			,					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1405 5.00 4.66 4.32 4.27 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1236 5.00 4.45 4.00 3.87 5.00 Discussion  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.57 4.14 3.95 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.75 4.33 4.15 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.18 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/873 5.00 4.59 4.03 3.89 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 General 0 Under-grad 4 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 are not enough responses to be significant							-							,					
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1236 5.00 4.45 4.00 3.87 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.57 4.14 3.95 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.75 4.33 4.15 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.18 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.18 5.00 5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.18 5.00 6. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/873 5.00 4.59 4.03 3.89 5.00  Trequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors										-	-	-							
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.57 4.14 3.95 5.00  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.75 4.33 4.15 5.00  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.18 5.00  4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 873 5.00 4.59 4.03 3.89 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 4 Non-major 3 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 responses to be significant						_	-	-	-	-	-	-		,					
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.57 4.14 3.95 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.75 4.33 4.15 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.18 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.18 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.79 4.03 3.89 5.00 4.70 4.59 4.03 3.89 5.00 4.00 5.00 4.59 4.03 3.89 5.00 4.00 5.00 4.59 4.03 3.89 5.00 4.00 5.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6	5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1260 5.00 4.57 4.14 3.95 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.75 4.33 4.15 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.18 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.18 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.79 4.03 3.89 5.00 4.70 4.59 4.03 3.89 5.00 4.00 5.00 4.59 4.03 3.89 5.00 4.00 5.00 4.59 4.03 3.89 5.00 4.00 5.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6			Discus	sion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.75 4.33 4.15 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.18 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/873 5.00 4.59 4.03 3.89 5.00	1. Did cl	ass discu			what vou learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.18 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/873 5.00 4.59 4.03 3.89 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 4 Non-major 3 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 responses to be significant							-	-	-		-			,					
4. Were special techniques successful  1 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/873 5.00 4.59 4.03 3.89 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 4 Non-major 3 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 responses to be significant  I 0 Other 1														,					
Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 4 Non-major 3 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 responses to be significant  I 0 Other 1			_		a open arboabbren									,					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 2 Graduate 0 Major 1 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 4 Non-major 3 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 responses to be significant  I 0 Other 1		F	1				_	-	-	-	-	_		_,					
00-27					Frequ	ency	Dis	tribu	ıtio	n									
28-55	Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
28-55	00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	auire	ed f	or Ma	iors	 S	2	Graduat	 е	0	Maic	 or	1
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 4 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 are not enough P 0 responses to be significant											. ,				-	-	) -		_
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 P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1		-					Ge:	nera:	L				0	Under-a	rad	4	Non-	-major	3
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1		1		0				- /						3				3	-
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1		0		1			El	ectiv	res				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	h
I 0 Other 1																		_	
					I 0		Ot:	her					1			3			
					? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 125 1 University of Maryland Page 1051 Title Theory I:Basics Of Mus Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Smith, Stuart S Instructor:

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	0	0	0	Ο	1	1	11	4.77	291/1509	4.71	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	245/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	127/1287	4.90	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	770/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	587/1406		4.45	4.09	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	767/1384		4.45	4.11	3.98	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	513/1489	4.50	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	466/1506		4.69	4.67	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	137/1463	4.66	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.78
	_	-	•	-	-	_								
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	430/1438	4.85	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1421	4.93	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	201/1411	4.85	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	239/1405	4.85	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	354/1236	4.49	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	389/1260	4.57	4.57	4.14	3.95	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	379/1255	4.76	4.75	4.33	4.15	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	456/1258	4.61	4.72	4.38	4.18	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	209/ 873	4.45	4.59	4.03	3.89	4.50
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	า									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 125 2 University of Maryland Title Theory I:Basics Of Mus

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1052

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Caracciolo, Step

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire 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 1 1 1 14 4.65 434/1509 4.71 4.66 4.31 4.18 4.65 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 14 4.76 245/1509 4.77 4.69 4.26 4.25 4.76 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 16 4.88 143/1287 4.90 4.76 4.30 4.24 4.88 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 1 2 13 4.75 191/1459 4.50 4.64 4.22 4.11 4.75 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 2 3 11 4.56 294/1406 4.41 4.45 4.09 4.02 4.56 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 0 1 3 10 4.64 243/1384 4.36 4.45 4.11 3.98 4.64 7. Was the grading system clearly explained

0 0 0 1 1 3 12 4.53 434/1489 4.50 4.50 4.17 4.20 4.53

0 1 7 9 4.47 1098/1506 4.70 4.69 4.67 4.66 4.47

Lecture

1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 0 1 13 4.93 175/1438 4.85 4.66 4.46 4.44 4.93 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3 0 0 0 1 0 13 4.86 665/1421 4.93 4.82 4.73 4.66 4.86 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 1 0 13 4.86 190/1411 4.85 4.66 4.31 4.27 4.86 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 0 13 4.86 228/1405 4.85 4.66 4.32 4.27 4.86 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0 2 2 10 4.57 229/1236 4.49 4.45 4.00 3.87 4.57

0 0 0

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 0 4 10 4.53 301/1463 4.66 4.49 4.09 4.02 4.53

Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 8 4.60 352/1260 4.57 4.57 4.14 3.95 4.60 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 0 9 4.80 287/1255 4.76 4.75 4.33 4.15 4.80 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 2 1 7 4.50 620/1258 4.61 4.72 4.38 4.18 4.50 7 5 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 261/873 4.45 4.59 4.03 3.89 4.40

4. Were special techniques successful

8. How many times was class cancelled

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	 А	5	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 170 1 University of Maryland Page 1053 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Beginning Voice Class

Jackson, Janice

Instructor:

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 23

Grad.

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	_					_	_	_			000/4500	4 ==		4 0 0		4 ==
		w insights,ski			3	0	0	0	Τ	3	16	4.75	303/1509	4.75	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.75
		tor make clear			3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	158/1509	4.85	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.85
		estions reflec			3	4	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	463/1287	4.56	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.56
		ations reflect		_	3	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	400/1459	4.55	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.55
	_	-		what you learned	3	0	0	2	4	4	10	4.10	739/1406	4.10	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.10
		_		o what you learned	3	8	0	2	2	1	-/	4.08	762/1384		4.45	4.11	3.98	4.08
		system clearly		ined	3	2	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.50
	-	was class canc			3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	350/1506	4.95	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.95
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	170/1463	4.72	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.72
		Lectur	_															
1 1/2 + h		Lectur ctor's lecture	-		2	0	0	0	0	7	1 2	4.65	603/1438	4.65	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.65
					3	0	0	0	0	1	13 19	4.05	322/1421	4.05	4.82	4.46	4.44	4.05
		tor seem inter		explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	<u>т</u>	14	4.95	376/1411	4.70	4.82	4.73	4.00	4.95
		eriai presente es contribute t			3	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	419/1405	4.70	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.70
				our understanding	4	10	2	0	0	1	1 <del>1</del>	4.70	664/1236		4.45	4.00	3.87	
5. Did auc	ilovisuai	. teciniiques en	nance y	our understanding	4	10	4	U	U	1	0	4.00	004/1230	4.00	4.45	4.00	3.07	4.00
		Discus	gion															
1 Did als	ace diecu			what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	520/1260	4.38	4.57	4.14	3.95	4.38
				d to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	184/1255	4.92	4.75	4.33	4.15	4.92
		_	_	d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	421/1258		4.72	4.38	4.18	4.75
		chniques succe		a open arbeablion	11	2	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	209/ 873		4.59	4.03	3.89	4.50
I. NOIC DE	,00141 00	Joining aco Succe	22242			_	ŭ	ŭ	_	5	·	1.50	203, 073	1.50	1.00	1.05	3.07	1.50
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 12		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 3			_									_		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	3	Non-	major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 0													-	

Electives

Other

12

3

### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

F

Ρ

I ?

0

1

0

1

3.50-4.00

Course-Section: MUSC 173 1 University of Maryland Title Intro To Choral Singin Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Jackson, Janice

Instructor:

Enrollment: 13 Ouestionnaires: 13

Grad.

3.50-4.00

F 0

P

I

0

0

0

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1054

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	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 vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	551/1509	4.55	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.55
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	495/1509		4.69	4.26	4.25	4.55
		estions reflec			2	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	326/1287	4.70	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.70
	_	ations reflect		-	2	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.67
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	6	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	656/1406	4.20	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.20
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	2	5	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	701/1384	4.17	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.17
7. Was th	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ained	2	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1249/1489	3.64	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.64
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	583/1506	4.91	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.91
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	786/1463	4.11	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.11
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lecture		prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	737/1438	4.56	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.56
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
				explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	279/1411	4.78	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.78
		es contribute t			4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.67
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	4	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	100/1236	4.80	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.80
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	ann dina			what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4 00	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
				ed to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1255		4.75	4.33	4.15	****
		_	_	nd open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1258		4.72	4.38	4.18	****
		echniques succe		ia open arbeabaton	10	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 873		4.59	4.03	3.89	****
	-	-																
				Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	 mir	 ed f	or Ma			0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		11.00	1411	-u 1	O= 1·10		_	0	Graduat	_	J	1.100 )	, <u>.</u>	_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				2	Under-q	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									5		-		3	_
	-		_															

Electives

Other

6

2

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 174 1 Title Beg Vocal Methods Instructor: Jackson, Janice Fall 2009

Enrollment: 5 Ouestionnaires: 5

Page 1055 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

responses to be significant

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

Frequencies

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	рерт	OMBC.	телет	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	om this course	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.50
_	_	ctor make clear			3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.00
		uestions reflec			3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.76	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1459	****	4.64	4.22	4.11	****
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.02	****
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	****	4.66	4.46	4.44	****
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.82	4.73	4.66	****
				explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1411	****	4.66	4.31	4.27	***
		es contribute t			4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1405	****	4.66	4.32	4.27	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
				ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1255		4.75	4.33	4.15	****
		-	_	nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1258			4.38	4.18	****
		echniques succe			4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 2					or Ma			1	 Graduat		0	Majo		1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		Re	quir	eu I	OT M	a JOE S	>	_	Graduat	C	U	Majo	JΤ	1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ce	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	5	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		GC.	iici a.	_				U	onder -g	Luu	5	14011	ilia JOI	7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	: enoug	јh
														_	_			

Other

1

P 0

I 0

? 0

Course-Section: MUSC 178 1 University of Maryland Page 1056 Title Begin Keyboard Skills Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Beith, Nancy S

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 14

## Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		om this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.67
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	175/1509	4.92	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.83
		uestions reflect		-	2	6	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	183/1287	4.92	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.83
		uations reflect			2	6	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	131/1459	4.92	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.83
				what you learned	3	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1406	4.50	4.45	4.09	4.02	****
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contri	bute t	to what you learned	3	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ained	3	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	308/1489	4.68	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.64
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	883/1506	4.86	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.73
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	.l tead	ching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	511/1463	4.27	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.36
		Lecture	<u>,</u>															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures		prepared	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1071/1438	4.38	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.25
		ctor seem intere			10	0	0	0	2	1	1		1379/1421	4.29	4.82	4.73	4.66	3.75
				explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	1	1		1204/1411	4.21	4.66	4.31	4.27	3.75
		es contribute to			10	0	0	0	3	0	1		1265/1405	4.08	4.66	4.32	4.27	3.50
				your understanding	10	2	0	1	1	0	0		****/1236		4.45	4.00	3.87	****
		Discuss	ion															
1 Did cl	agg dige			what you learned	13	0	0	Ο	1	0	0	3 00	****/1260	4 00	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
				ed to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1255		4.75	4.33	4.15	****
		-	_	nd open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1258		4.72	4.38	4.18	****
		echniques succes			13	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 873			4.03	3.89	****
				Frequ	.ency	7 Dist	cribu	ution	n									
								_					_				'	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a		enoug	ſh

Other

0

Ρ

I ?

0

0

0

Course-Section: MUSC 178 2 University of Maryland Page 1057 Title MAR 22, 2010

Frequencies

Instructor

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Baltimore County Begin Keyboard Skills Fall 2009 Instructor: Beith, Nancy S

Enrollment:	7	
Questionnaires:	7	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							P L	eque.	пстег	3		Inst	ructor	Course	рерс	UMBC	телет	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	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.67
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	4.92	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
		estions reflec			1	3	0	0	0	0	3				4.76	4.30		
	_	uations reflect		_	1	2	0	0	0	0	4		1/1459	4.92		4.22		
				what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50			4.45	4.09		4.50
				what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.00
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71		4.68	4.50	4.17	4.20	
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	4.86	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	726/1463	4.27	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.17
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	800/1438	4.38	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.50
		ctor seem inter			1		0	0	0	1		4.83		4.29	4.82			
				xplained clearly	1		0	0	1			4.67			4.66	4.31		4.67
					1		0	0	1	0		4.67		4.08	4.66	4.32		4.67
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					2	0	0	0	2	2		,					4.50
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	ace dieci			what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	746/1260	4 00	4 57	4 14	3 95	4.00
				d to participate	5		0	1	0	-			1127/1255			4.33		3.50
				d open discussion	5		0	1	0	0	1		1143/1258		4.72	4.38	4.18	3.50
		echniques succe		a open arseassion	4	-	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 873				3.89	****
	-	_																
				Frequ	ıency	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	 A 5		Re	guir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	 3	 7	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 0			1				-		- 210101010	-	-	5		_
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	7	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 1									3				3	
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	лh
	91au. 0 5.50-4.00 0 F 0												respons				_	
	I 0					Ot:	her					0	-		5			
	? 0																	

Course-Section: MUSC 179 1

Title Interm Keyboard Skills

Instructor: Beith, Nancy S

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 15

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1058 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### 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
Q1														
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	6	2	4 00	1051/1509	4.26	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	4	3 7	4.09	390/1509	4.26	4.69	4.31	4.18	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	6	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1287		4.76	4.20	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1459		4.76	4.22	4.11	4.88
	4	10	0	0	0	1	/		****/1406		4.64	4.22	4.11	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4		0	-	0	Ţ	0		,					
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	2	0	0	0	2	/	4.78	175/1489		4.50	4.17	4.20	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	6	5		1118/1506		4.69	4.67	4.66	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	U	U	U	9	2	4.18	702/1463	4.17	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1411		4.66	4.31	4.27	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1405		4.66	4.32	4.27	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1236		4.45	4.00	3.87	****
5. 214 dddiovidadi cominiques emianoe jour anacistanding		Ū	Ü	Ū	_	Ü	Ü	3.00	, 1230		1.15	1.00	3.07	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	****
- 1														
Laboratory	1.4	0	^	0	-	•	_	2 00		ate ate ate ate	F 00	4 00	4 1 4	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 198		5.00	4.22	4.14	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	Τ	0	0		****/ 184		5.00	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 177		5.00	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.15	****
Tree and		D. 2 4	la-											

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	9	 Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	1	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 sid	qnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		_	
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 179 2

Interm Keyboard Skills

Bal

Title Interm Keyboar Instructor: Beith, Nancy S

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1059 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions  General  Did you gain new insights, skills from this course Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned Did written assignments contribute to what you learned Was the grading system clearly explained How many times was class cancelled	NR 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	NA 0 0 3 3 4 4	1 0 0 0	2  0 0 0	3 0 0	4  0 0	6	Mean 	Rank  698/1509	Mean  4.26	Mean	Mean	Mean	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. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1 1 1 1 1	0 3 3 4	0	0	0	0	-		698/1509	4.26				
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1 1 1 1 1	0 3 3 4	0	0	0	0	-		698/1509	4.26				
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1 1 1 1 1	3 3 4	0	-	0	0					4.66	4.31	4.18	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1 1 1 1	3	0	0		U	7	5.00	1/1509	4.82	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1 1 1	4	-		0	0	4	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1 1	_	_	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	4.94	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00
			0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	121/1489	4.82	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.86
		0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	682/1506	4.66	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	726/1463	4.17	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	***	4.45	4.00	3.87	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	***	5.00	4.22	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.29	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.51	4.53	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.18	4.26	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.82	4.26	4.28	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/ 41		4.69	4.14	4.13	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/ 46		4.83		4.52	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/ 37		4.83	4.05	4.47	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.21	5.00
Freque	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	3

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	4
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: MUSC 180 1

Beginning Piano Class

Title Beginning Pian Instructor: Beith, Nancy S

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 22

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1060 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	mier	ncies			Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	673/1509	4.45	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	201/1509	4.63	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	76/1287	4.90	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	218/1459	4.56	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.72
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	702/1406	4.20	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	807/1384	3.83	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	1	14	4.40	597/1489	4.27	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	618/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	305/1438	4.85	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	691/1421	4.78	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	327/1411	4.59	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	432/1405	4.72	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	2	2	4	9	4.18	554/1236	4.13	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	1	2		1045/1260	3.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	2	2		****/1255	3.67	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	1	1	2		****/1258	3.27	4.72	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****
Tabanakann														
Laboratory	0.1	0	-	_	0	_	_	1 00	/ 104	ale ale ale ale	F 00	4 16	4 06	ate ate ate ate
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 184	****	5.00	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 198	****	5.00	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21 21	0	0	0 1	1	0	0		****/ 177 ****/ 165	****	5.00	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	U	U	Т	U	U	U	2.00	/ 105	***	5.00	4.18	4.15	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 93	****	5.00	4.06	3.92	****
J. Hold Oliberia for grading made orbar		ŭ	ŭ	Ü	Ū	_	Ü	1.00	, , , , ,		3.00	1.00	3.72	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	3.75	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.29	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.51	4.53	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.18	4.26	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	19/ 49	4.61	4.82	4.26	4.28	4.60
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	3	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	17/ 41	4.29	4.69	4.14	4.13	4.14
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	1	0	0	2	2		4.33	27/ 46	4.38	4.83	4.31	4.52	4.33
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	3	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	23/ 37	4.48	4.83	4.05	4.47	4.29
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	5	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: MUSC 180 1

Title Beginning Piano Class

Instructor: Beith, Nancy S

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1060 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	10	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 180 2 Title

Beginning Piano Class

Instructor: Beith, Nancy S

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1061 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions		NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	661/1509	4.45	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	621/1509	4.43	4.69	4.26	4.10	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	167/1287	4.90	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	619/1459	4.56	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	575/1406	4.20	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	1	1	0	1	3		1107/1384	3.83	4.45	4.11	3.98	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	3	6	10	4.14	875/1489	4.27	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	424/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	291/1438	4.85	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	2	18	4.71	950/1421	4.78	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	689/1411	4.59	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	345/1405	4.72	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	625/1236	4.13	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	3	1	4	3	3.42	1086/1260	3.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	2	2	2	5		1084/1255	3.67	4.75	4.33	4.15	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	2	1	3	3		1195/1258	3.27	4.72	4.38	4.18	3.27
4. Were special techniques successful	12	9	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	18/ 49	4.61	4.82	4.26	4.28	4.63
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	12/ 41	4.29	4.69	4.14	4.13	4.43
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	25/ 46	4.38	4.83	4.31	4.52	4.43
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	17/ 37	4.48	4.83	4.05	4.47	4.67
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	2	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.27	4.21	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	16	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	В	1						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General		Under-grad	22	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	12	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 184 1 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title Beginning Woodwind Cla

Instructor: Spece, Richard D

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2009

Page 1062

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Λ	Λ	1	2	E	4.44	673/1509	4.44	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	٥	0	4.78	234/1509	4.78	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.78
· · ·	0	0	0	0	T	2	0	4.70	359/1287	4.76	4.76	4.30	4.25	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	-	-	0	0	3	0		,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	Τ	4	4.80	146/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	786/1463	4.11	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.11
Lecture														
		0	0	_	0	0	_	4 60	685 (1400	4 60	4 66	4 46	4 44	4 60
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1405	4.60	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	***	4.45	4.00	3.87	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sid	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-		5	
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 185 1 University of Maryland Page 1063 MAR 22, 2010 Title Interm Woodwind Class Baltimore County Instructor: Spece,Richard D Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	8
Ougationnoimog:	0

Questions

FIII OTTIMETIC.	U
Ouestionnaires:	8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	882/1509	4.25	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.25
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	731/1509	4.38	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	403/1287	4.63	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.63
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	0	5	3.75	1045/1406	3.75	4.45	4.09	4.02	3.75
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.33
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	630/1489	4.38	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.38
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.33
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1312/1421	4.20	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.20
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	758/1405	4.40	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.40
5. Did aud	our understanding	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00			
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.75	4.33	4.15	4.50
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Тур	e			Majors	;
00-27	A 4		Re	 guir	ed f	or M	 ajors	 3	7	Graduate	· :	0	Majo	 or	7			
28-55	1	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	в 4			-			5						<b>J</b> -		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-gr	ad	8	Non-	major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3					
Grad.	0	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enou	ıh		
		3.50-4.00	2	P 0									responses to be significant					
				I O		Ot1	her					0			5-			
									-									

Baltimore County

Page 1064

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: MUSC 188 1 University of Maryland Title Percussion Class Instructor: Goldstein, Thoma

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 15

20

4. Were special techniques successful

				Fr	eque	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.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	1010/1509	4.13	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.13
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	201/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.80
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	229/1287	4.79	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.79
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.50
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	3.98	***
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	1	3	7	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.00
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	408/1506	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.93
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	8	3	3.80	1060/1463	3.80	4.49	4.09	4.02	3.80
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.60
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.80
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	419/1405	4.70	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.70
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	3.87	***
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	4.00
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.15	4.80
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	850/1258		4.72	4.38	4.18	4.20

#### Frequency Distribution

10 2 0 1 0 0 2 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 873 \*\*\*\* 4.59 4.03 3.89 \*\*\*\*

Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	 Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 1 University of Maryland Title Perf.Studies:Western A Baltimore County

Franklin,Rachel 9 Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 5

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1065

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	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. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.71	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	986/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	990/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	664/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	4.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.18	***
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	***

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	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	5	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section	n: MUSC 190 10	University of Maryland	Page 1066
Title	Perf.Studies:Western A	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:	Kannen,Maria La	Fall 2009	Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Kannen, Maria La Fall 2009 Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 2 Student Course Evaluation	n Ouestionnaire
---	-----------------

С

D

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

0

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

0

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst: Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills	from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear th		0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1509		4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancel	- 3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506		4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00	
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures of the instructor seem interests.  3. Was lecture material presented at the lectures contribute to other them.	1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 1 1	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	1/1438 1/1421 1/1411 1/1405	4.97 4.92	4.66 4.82 4.66 4.66	4.46 4.73 4.31 4.32	4.44 4.66 4.27 4.27	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	
	Frequ	ıency	Dist	tribu	ation	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	_			Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	5 5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0	

General

Other

Electives

0

2

0

Under-grad 2

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Non-major

#### Course-Section: MUSC 190 11 University of Maryland Page 1067 Title Perf.Studies:Western A Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Ladd,Gita

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr	equei 2	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1306/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.71	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	4.82	4.45	4.09	4.02	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	***
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1476/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	3.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405		4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236		4.45	4.00	3.87	****

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	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	5	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	•		
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 13 University of Maryland Title Perf.Studies:Western A Baltimore County Fall 2009

Dunlap, Matthew

Instructor: 3

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1068

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	_		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	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.71	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1203/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1162/1260	4.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	1	-		-	
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 15
Title Perf.Studies:We

Perf.Studies:Western A

Instructor: Kesner,Lori A.

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1069 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### 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	1	3	4.75	303/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	325/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	4.74	4.82	4.26	4.28	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	4.76	4.69	4.14	4.13	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	4.93	4.83	4.31	4.52	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	4.92	4.83	4.05	4.47	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.21	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	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	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 2 University of Maryland Title Perf.Studies:Western A

Baltimore County

Hawley JR, Thoma Instructor:

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 12

MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 1070

Student	Course	Firalization	Ouestionnain	ra

		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	Λ	0	Λ	0	Λ	1	11	4.92	143/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	- 6	4.55	495/1509		4.69	4.26	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	1	1		****/1287		4.76	4.30	4.24	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	2		****/1459		4.64	4.22	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	269/1406		4.45	4.09	4.02	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	0	0	1	1		****/1384		4.45	4.11	3.98	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	4	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	674/1489		4.50	4.17	4.20	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	583/1506		4.69	4.67	4.66	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	438/1463		4.49	4.09	4.02	4.43
J. now would you grade the overall teaching circultations	-	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	3	1.15	130/1103	1.07	1.17	1.05	1.02	1.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	17/ 49		4.82	4.26	4.28	4.64
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	3	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	14/ 41		4.69	4.14	4.13	4.29
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	21/ 46		4.83	4.31	4.52	4.70
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	4	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	15/ 37		4.83	4.05	4.47	4.83
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.21	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0			_		-	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 28 University of Maryland Page 1071 Title Perf.Studies:Western A Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Dove,Barry B
Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 3

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	3	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	4.82	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	588/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	4.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	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	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 37

Perf.Studies:Western A

Title Richards, Kazuko Instructor:

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1072 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	2				ructor	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	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	3	4.75	303/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	543/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	924/1287	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.24	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	770/1459	4.71	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	223/1406	4.82	4.45	4.09	4.02	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	619/1384	4.63	4.45	4.11	3.98	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	760/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	853/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1203/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	881/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	885/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	896/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	664/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	936/1260	4.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	904/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.15	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	818/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.18	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	25/ 49	4.74	4.82	4.26	4.28	4.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	4.76	4.69	4.14	4.13	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 46	4.93	4.83	4.31	4.52	5.00
s. Here four concasts with the imprinced hereign	-	_	3	3	J	J	_	3.00	2, 10	1.75	1.05	1.51	1.52	3.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section:	: MUSC 190 4	University o	of Maryland	Page 1073
Title	Perf.Studies:Western A	Baltimore	County	MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:	Caracciolo,Step	Fall	2009	Job IRBR3029

Course-Section:	MUSC 190 4	University of	Maryland	Pa	age
Title	Perf.Studies:Western A	Baltimore (	County	MAR 2	22
Instructor:	Caracciolo, Step	Fall	2009	Job I	IRI

Enrollment:	4	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Frequencies					Inst	Instructor		Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did th	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00				
8. How ma	any times		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00		
9. How wo	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00			
	Frequency Distribution																	
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			_											
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	F 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h			
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					0						
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 190 5 University of Maryland Perf.Studies:Western A

Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: Jackson, Janice Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4	
Ougstiennsines:	2	

FIII OT THEFIC.	
Questionnaires:	2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1074

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	598/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	543/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	979/1459	4.71	4.64	4.22	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1131/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
Frequ	iency	Frequency Distribution												

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	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	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	Λ						

Course-Section	: MUSC 190 7	University of Maryland	Pa
Title	Perf.Studies:Western A	Baltimore County	MAR 2

Page 1075 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: Markovic-Prakas Fall 2009

Enrollment:	3	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Leve		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	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	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	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	0 #### - Means there are		are not enough	ι
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 8 Title Perf.Studies:Western A

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi Enrollment:

3 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1076 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.71	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	4.82	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00
				o what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.63	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00
		g system clearl		ined	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
		was class canc			0 1	0	0	0	0	2	1		1205/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.33
9. How wor	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness							0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00
		actor's lecture			2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.74	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.97	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	0	1		1/1411	4.92	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.92	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	2	0	U	U	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.46	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.80	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
		_		d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	5.00
		Self																
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 49	4.74	4.82	4.26	4.28	5.00
3. Were yo	our conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 46	4.93	4.83	4.31	4.52	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	crib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	2	Graduate	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		General						0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0										_				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Electives						1	#### - 1				_	ın
				P 0		Ohbass					0	response	es to b	e sign	ııııcan	ıt		
				I 0		Other						0						

? 0

Course-Section	: MUSC 190 9	University o	f Maryland	Page 1077
Title	Perf.Studies:Western A	Baltimore	County	MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:	Tremblay,Christ	Fall	2009	Job IRBR3029

Tremblay,Christ Fall 2009 Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnair
-------------------	---------	--------	------------	--------------

	Fre			Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions		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	1	4.50	598/1509	4.88	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.77	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1506	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	4.67	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	1	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	1	F	0	Electives	1	<pre>#### - Means there are not enoug responses to be significant</pre>		are not enough	L
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 191 2 University of Mary:
Title Recital Preparation Baltimore County
Instructor: Bailey, Connie C Fall 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

17

University of Maryland Page 1078
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	Student	Course	Evaluation	Question	naire
---	---------	--------	------------	----------	-------

			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	1	5.00	1/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.93	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.93	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.41	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
Frequ	lency	Dist	crib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe 			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	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	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 191 3 University of Maryland Title Recital Preparation Baltimore County Instructor: Wonneberger, Ala Fall 2009

niversity of Maryland Page 1079
Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010
Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	24				
Questionnaires:	24	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Ouestions							-	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did voi	ı gain nev	w insights,ski	_	this course	10	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	852/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.29
		tor make clear			10	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	158/1509		4.69	4.26	4.25	4.86
		estions reflect			10	6	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1287		4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
		ations reflect			10	6	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1459		4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
				hat you learned	10	9	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.02	****
6. Did wr	itten ass:	ignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	10	8	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	10	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	121/1489	4.93	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.86
8. How man	ny times v	was class cance	elled		10	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you gi	rade the overa	ll teach	ing effectiveness	13	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	114/1463	4.41	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.82
				_														
		Lecture	е															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture:	s well p	repared	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	****
2. Did the	e instruct	tor seem inter	ested in	the subject	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	****
3. Was led	Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	****
4. Did the	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	****
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	3.87	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were a	ll student	ts actively end	couraged	to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1255		4.75	4.33	4.15	****
				open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/1258		4.72	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		20	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	3.89	****
				Freq	uency	7 Dis	tribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Re	 quire		or Ma		 s 1	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		100	quir	-u - c	JI 110	. , 0 .	_	. •	Gradade	_	Ü	11000	-	10
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	neral					0	Under-g	rad 2	24	Non-	major	14
84-150						20.						-	9				5	
Grad.						El	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	rh
	P 0											-	respons				_	•
	I 0					Ot:	her					0	-		5			
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 193 1 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

Perf Studies Musc Majo Franklin,Rachel 6 Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 3

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1080 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Out of the same	M	373	Fre	-	ncies		-		ructor	Course	_	-	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	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	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.60	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1205/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.83	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	2	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	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	1	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193 11 University of Maryland Page 1081 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Ladd,Gita

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2009

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	0	2	4.33	800/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	774/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.83	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	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	3	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193 12 University of Maryland Title Perf Studies Musc Majo Baltimore County

Lagana, Thomas V

Instructor: Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2009

Page 1082 MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						Instr	uctor	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 from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.83	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00

#### Frequency Distribution

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.18 5.00

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum.			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	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 si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193 13 University of Maryland Title Perf Studies Musc Majo Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Dunlap,Matthew Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2009

Page 1083

Job IRBR3029

			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	1	3	4.75	303/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	543/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1422/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.60	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1258/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	325/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	Ω	Λ	0	0	1	Ω	4.00	746/1260	4.83	4.57	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
5. Dia the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	J	5	5	3	5	_	3.00	1/1250	3.00	1.72	1.30	1.10	3.00

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 193 14	University of Maryland	Page 1
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2
Instructor:	Cella,Lisa M	Fall 2009	Job IRBR

Instructor: Cella,Lisa M

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 2

_			
Student	Course	Fvaluation	Questionnaire
Deddelle	COULDC	DValuation	Queberonnarie

1084 2010

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	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	543/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1403/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture								- 00						

2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.82 4.73 4.66 5.00

Credits Earned Cum. (				Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	2	 Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	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	2	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 193 15 Title Perf Studies Musc Majo

Kesner,Lori A. Instructor:

1 Enrollment: Questionnaires: 1 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1085 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equen	cies			Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Secti	on: MUSC 193 17	University of Maryland	Page 1086
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Richards, Edwin Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

			Fre	quer	cies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General									1 /1500	4 04	4 66	4 21	4 10	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	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	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section	n: MUSC 193 18	University of Maryland	Page 1087
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:	Spece, Richard D	Fall 2009	Job IRBR3029

Spece,Richard D Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 1

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions		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	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1422/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.00

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193 27 University of Maryland Title Perf Studies Musc Majo Baltimore County

Perf Studies Musc Majo Goldstein,Thoma

Instructor: Gold
Enrollment: 3
Questionnaires: 2

Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1088 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Ev	luation Questionnaire
-------------------	-----------------------

Questions						NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst: Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																
_	_	w insights,skil			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.84		4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
	_	estions reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	4.60	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00
6. Did wri	tten ass	signments contri	.bute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	/ expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	ne instru			prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1236		4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00
		-	-	J														
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1260	4.83		4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were al	.1 studer	its actively end	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage f	air an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succes	sful		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0			0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	0				
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	Electives					0	#### - Means there are not en				enoug	h

Other

0

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Course-Sectio	on: MUSC 193 28	University of Maryland	Page 1
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County	MAR 22,

1089 2010

Instructor: Dove, Barry B Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

1110 01 00 001	Dove, Darry D	1411 2007
Enrollment:	2	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	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	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	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	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section	: MUSC 193 33	University of Maryland	Page 1090
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:	Ruas,Laura Mari	Fall 2009	Job IRBR3029

Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore	County	N
Instructor:	Ruas, Laura Mari	Fall	2009	Ţ
Enrollment:	3			

Questionnaires: 2

Questions		NA	Fre	equer 2			5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  8. How many times was class cancelled  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0 0	0	0 0	0 0	2 2	0	4.00 4.00	598/1509 1086/1509 1383/1506 325/1463	4.76 4.55	4.69 4.69	4.26 4.67	4.25 4.66	4.00 4.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		ned Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
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	1	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	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section	: MUSC 193 4	University of Maryland	Page 1091
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:	Caracciolo,Step	Fall 2009	Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Caracciolo, Step
Enrollment: 4 Fall 2009

Enrollment:	4			
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Frequencies						ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions		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	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1333/1406	4.60	4.45	4.09	4.02	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	986/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00

Credits E	arned	arned Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	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	Under-grad 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 193 6	University of	Maryland	Page 1092
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore (	County	MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:	King, Thomas D.	Fall 2	2009	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3	
Ouestionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions		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	4.00	1114/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1086/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.00
Frequency Distribution														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate 0		Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General		Under-grad	Under-grad 1		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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Sect	ion: MUSC 193 7	University of Maryland	Page 1093
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Markovic-Prakas Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3		
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	Course

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions		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	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	1	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193 8 University of Maryland Title Perf Studies Musc Majo Baltimore County

Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

## Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1094

MAR 22, 2010

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	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.60	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	941/1506	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	3.87	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	4.83	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.59	4.03	3.89	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		3	Required for Majors	3	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	3	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			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section:	: MUSC 193 9	University o	f Maryland	Page 1095
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore	County	MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:	Tremblay, Christ	Fall	2009	Job IRBR3029

Course-Section	: MUSC 193 9	University of Mary	Pag Pag
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore Count	y MAR 22
Instructor:	Tremblay,Christ	Fall 2009	Job IR

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3		5	Instr Mean	uctor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.68	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades Reasons		Type 			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	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	0					
				?	0							

Course-Sect	ion: MUSC 194 12	University of Maryland	Page 1096
Title	Perf Studies: Musc Maj	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010

Lagana, Thomas V

Instructor: Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 2

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies					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	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.75	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	4.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	3.98	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	4.63	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	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	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 194 13 University of Maryland Page 1097
Title Perf Studies: Musc Maj Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Dunlap, Matthew

Enrollment: 2
Ouestionnaires: 2

0

0

0

56-83 84-150

Grad.

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

0

С

D

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

0

Fall 2009
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Non-major

								Fre	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera																
1. I	Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. I	oid the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.75	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
			uestions reflec			0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1247/1287	4.00	4.76	4.30	4.24	3.00
8. I	How man	ny times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.50
9. I	How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	all tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	4.63	4.49	4.09	4.02	5.00
			Lectur	re															
1. V	Were th	he instru	uctor's lecture	es well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. I	oid the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	rested	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. V	Was le	cture mat	terial presente	ed and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.27	5.00
4. I	Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.27	5.00
			Discus	sion															
1. I	oid cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	3.95	5.00
2. V	Were a	ll studer	nts actively er	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.15	5.00
3. I	Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.18	5.00
			Self	Paced															
1. I	Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	oute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.82	4.26	4.28	5.00
					Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Cred	dits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-	 -27	0	 0.00-0.99	0	 A 2		Red	auir	 -d f	or Ma	iors		2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	2
	-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		1000	-1 0.1.1	- A I	J_ 110	. ,	-	-	Gradat	_	-	11000	-	-
		-	2.00 2.33	-									_		_	_			_

General

Other

Electives

0

0

0

Under-grad 2

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section	: MUSC 194 15	University of Maryland	Page 1098
Title	Perf Studies: Musc Maj	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:	Kesner,Lori A.	Fall 2009	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

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

			Fre	eque	ncie	s	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	2	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	4.75	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.17	4.20	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.50	4.69	4.67	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.63	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.66	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.82	4.26	4.28	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	4.83	4.31	4.52	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.83	4.05	4.47	5.00
Frequ	Dist	crib	utio	n										

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	1	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	Under-grad 2		0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other		-			
				?	0						

Course-Sect	tion: MUSC 194 6	University of Maryland	Page 1099
Title	Perf Studies: Musc Maj	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010

King, Thomas D. Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Enrollment:	1	
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	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1086/1509	4.75	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.50	4.69	4.67	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.63	4.49	4.09	4.02	4.00
Frequ	Dist	cribu	utior	ı										

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Ĺ	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	1	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 210 1 University of Maryland Page 1100
Title Musicianship Lab III Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Cella, Lisa M

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 12

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	410/1509	4.61	4.66	4.31	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instruct			0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	175/1509	4.81	4.69	4.26	4.32	4.83
3. Did the exam que		-	0	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	127/1287	4.84	4.76	4.30	4.35	4.91
4. Did other evalua			0	2	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	146/1459	4.73	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.80
	dings contribute to	-	0	3	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	152/1406	4.78	4.45	4.09	4.09	4.78
_	-	to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	364/1489	4.60	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.58
8. How many times w	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1258/1506	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.61	4.25
_		ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	118/1463	4.90	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.80
	Lecture															
1 Mana tha instance						0	0	0	_	г оо	1 /1 / 2 0	г оо	1	4.46	1 10	5.00
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66		4.48	
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421 243/1411	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	5.00
	-		/	0	0	0	0	T	4	4.80	,	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.37	4.80
4. Did the lectures 5. Did audiovisual		-	6 7	0 2	0	0	U T	0	5	4.67 5.00	459/1405 1/1236	4.67 5.00	4.66 4.45	4.32	4.39 4.11	4.67 5.00
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	,	۷	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	1/1230	5.00	4.45	4.00	4.11	5.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	3	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.57	4.14	4.19	4.50
2. Were all student	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.75	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instruct	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.72	4.38	4.44	4.50		
4. Were special tec	4. Were special techniques successful				0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.04	****
Frequ					trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	
	arned Cum. GPA Expected Grade					1.0.		_			- 11					

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 210 2 University of Maryland Page 1101 Title Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Musicianship Lab III

Instructor: Cella,Lisa M Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions		NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	540/1509	4.61	4.66	4.31	4.34	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	234/1509	4.81	4.69	4.26	4.32	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	240/1287	4.84	4.76	4.30	4.35	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	280/1459	4.73	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	4.78	4.45	4.09	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	4.09	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	319/1489	4.60	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	4.63	4.69	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1463	4.90	4.49	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.48	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1411	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.37	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1405	4.67	4.66	4.32	4.39	****

Fall 2009

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	9	
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	1							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	are not enough	re not enough		
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other		-	_			
				?	1							

Course-Section: MUSC 218 1 University of Maryland Title Recording Techniques

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1102

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Parent, James C.

Instructor:

			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		Genera	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain new	w insights,ski	_	m this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	159/1509	4.90	4.66	4.31	4.34	4.90
		tor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	201/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.32	4.80
		estions reflect			2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	326/1287	4.70	4.76	4.30	4.35	4.70
	_	ations reflect		_	2	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	106/1459	4.89	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.89
				what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.45	4.09	4.09	4.00
6. Did wri	itten ass:	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	2	7	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	4.09	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	243/1489	4.70	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.70
8. How mar	ny times v	was class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wou	uld you gi	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	658/1463	4.22	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.22
		Lecture	2															
1 Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture:		nrenared	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.44	878/1438	4.44	4.66	4.46	4.48	4.44
		tor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	588/1421	4.89	4.82	4.73	4.76	4.89
			3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	556/1411	4.56	4.66	4.31	4.37	4.56		
	<ol> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clear</li> <li>Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>							0	0	3	6	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.66	4.32	4.39	4.67
				our understanding	3 4	0 1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	83/1236	4.86	4.45	4.00	4.11	
		1		3									,					
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	244/1260	4.75	4.57	4.14	4.19	4.75
2. Were al	ll student	ts actively end	courage	d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.75	4.33	4.37	4.75
3. Did the	e instruct	tor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.72	4.38	4.44	4.75
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succes	ssful		8	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.59	4.03	4.04	4.67
				Frequ	iency	, Dist	trib	ıt i oı	า									
				1					· <del>-</del>									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	rades Reasons Type Majors									;				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor		8	Graduate		0	Majo		5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera:	l				0	Under-gr	ad 1	2	Non-	major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0							J							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00						ves				2	#### - Means there are not enough			ŗh		
				P 0									response	s to b	e sign	ifican	it	
				I 0		Other						0	_					

Course-Section: MUSC 221 1 University of Maryland Page 1103 Title Jazz Thry And Aural Sk Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Belzer,Matthew

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	Ο	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.32	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.45	4.11	4.09	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	760/1489	4.25	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.49	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1438		4.66	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.39	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.45	4.00	4.11	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.59	4.03	4.04	4.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	0	-	_		
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 223 1 Jazz Composition Belzer,Matthew Fall 2009

Title

Instructor:

Page 1104 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4	
Questionnaires:	4	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5		ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	
		Genera	_			_				_								
_	_	ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1509		4.66	4.31	4.34	5.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.32	5.00
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1287		4.76	4.30	4.35	5.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.30	5.00
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1406		4.45	4.09	4.09	5.00
		_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1384		4.45	4.11	4.09	5.00
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1489		4.50	4.17	4.19	5.00
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1506		4.69	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How wor	ula you g	grade the overa	II teac	hing effectiveness	2	0	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.49	4.09	4.08	5.00
		T a = b	_															
1 77	1	Lectur			^	0	0	0	0	^	_	г оо	1 /1 420	г оо	1	1 10	4 40	F 00
		actor's lecture			2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438		4.66 4.82	4.46	4.48	5.00
		ctor seem inter		n the subject xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1421 1/1411		4.82	4.73 4.31	4.76 4.37	5.00 5.00
					2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1411		4.66	4.31	4.37	5.00
	<ul><li>4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned</li><li>5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding</li></ul>				2	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/1405		4.66		4.39	
5. Did au	.aiovisua.	r recilitques en	nance y	our understanding	2	1	U	U	U	U	Τ.	5.00	1/1230	5.00	4.45	4.00	4.11	5.00
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al-	aga diga			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	4.19	5.00
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1255		4.75	4.33	4.19	5.00
				d co participate d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1258		4.72	4.38	4.44	5.00
		echniques succe		a open arscussion	2	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 1238		4.59	4.03	4.04	
4. Were b	peciai te	ciniiques succe	SSLUI		2	_	U	U	U	U		5.00	1/ 6/3	5.00	4.55	4.03	4.04	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 S	2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			,								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
				P 0									respons				_	,
				I O		Oth	her					0	-		5			
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 224 1 Instrumentation Dusman,Linda J Fall 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 14

Title

Questionnaires: 14

MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Page 1105

	Ouestionnaire

			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	1	0	13	4.86	201/1509	4.86	4.66	4.31	4.34	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	158/1509	4.86	4.69	4.26	4.32	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	304/1287	4.71	4.76	4.30	4.35	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	77/1459	4.92	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	423/1406	4.43	4.45	4.09	4.09	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	107/1384	4.80	4.45	4.11	4.09	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	937/1489	4.07	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	466/1506	4.92	4.69	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	263/1463	4.58	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	219/1438	4.90	4.66	4.46	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1411	4.90	4.66	4.31	4.37	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	172/1405	4.90	4.66	4.32	4.39	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	421/1236	4.33	4.45	4.00	4.11	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	308/1260	4.67	4.57	4.14	4.19	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.75	4.33	4.37	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.72	4.38	4.44	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.04	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	า
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 225 1 University of Maryland Page 1106 Title Theory III:Counterpoin Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

3.50-4.00 7

Instructor: Morin, Joseph C

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 19

Grad.

	I	Fall	2009	
Student	Course	Evalua	ation	Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	-															
		ew insights,skil			7	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	505/1509	4.58	4.66	4.31	4.34	4.58
2. Did the	instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	7	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	774/1509	4.33	4.69	4.26	4.32	4.33
3. Did the	exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	7	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.76	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	7	3	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.30	4.67
5. Did ass	igned re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	753/1406	4.08	4.45	4.09	4.09	4.08
6. Did wri	tten ass	signments contri	.bute t	o what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	174/1384	4.73	4.45	4.11	4.09	4.73
7. Was the	grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	7	1	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	738/1489	4.27	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.27
8. How man	y times	was class cance	elled		7	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1353/1506	4.08	4.69	4.67	4.61	4.08
9. How wou	ld you g	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	579/1463	4.30	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.30
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were th	e instru	actor's lectures	well	prepared	9	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	1116/1438	4.20	4.66	4.46	4.48	4.20
		ctor seem intere			9	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	1084/1421	4.60	4.82	4.73	4.76	4.60
				xplained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	4	4		936/1411	4.20	4.66	4.31	4.37	4.20
		es contribute to			9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	285/1405	4.80	4.66	4.32	4.39	4.80
				our understanding	9	1	0	0	0	5	4				4.45	4.00	4.11	4.44
		Discuss	ui on															
1 Did ala	ee diea:			what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	Λ	2	4 25	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	4.19	****
				d to participate	15	0	0	0	1	1	2		****/1255	****	4.75	4.33	4.37	****
				d open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	3		****/1258		4.72	4.38	4.44	****
		echniques succes		a open arscussion	15	1	0	1	1	1	0		****/ 873			4.03	4.04	***
				F		- D-1	16-											
Fi						7 Dist	cribu	JT 101	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra								Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	 ajor	 s 1	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	12
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	в 6			-			-						3 -		
56-83						Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	7
84-150	3	D 0													_			

Electives

Other

0

0

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

0

0

0

Ρ

I ?

Course-Section: MUSC 230 1 University of Maryland Page 1107 Title Musics Of The World Baltimore County

MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: Beck,Gina C Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	31	
Questionnaires:	31	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	.s		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2		s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean			Sect Mean
		Genera	-															
		ew insights,ski			6	0	0	0	5	4	16	4.44	673/1509		4.66	4.31	4.34	4.44
		ctor make clear			6	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	245/1509	4.76	4.69	4.26	4.32	4.76
		uestions reflec			6	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	304/1287	4.72	4.76	4.30	4.35	4.72
		uations reflect		_	6	15	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	146/1459		4.64	4.22	4.30	4.80
	_	_		what you learned	6	2	1	2	3	7	10	4.00	813/1406		4.45	4.09	4.09	4.00
		_		o what you learned	6	18	0	0	1	0	6		****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.09	****
		g system clearl		ined	7	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	319/1489		4.50	4.17	4.19	4.63
	-	was class cand			6	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	233/1506		4.69	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	.ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	7	12	5	3.92	970/1463	3.92	4.49	4.09	4.08	3.92
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	305/1438	4.84	4.66	4.46	4.48	4.84
		ctor seem inter			6	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	588/1421	4.88	4.82	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	201/1411	4.84	4.66	4.31	4.37	4.84
		es contribute t			6	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	393/1405	4.72	4.66	4.32	4.39	4.72
				our understanding	7	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	76/1236	4.88	4.45	4.00	4.11	4.88
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cla	agg diga			what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	701/1260	4.13	4.57	4.14	4.19	4.13
				d to participate	23	0	3	0	1	1	3		1198/1255	3.13	4.75	4.33	4.37	3.13
				d open discussion	23	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	818/1258	4.25	4.72	4.38	4.44	4.25
		echniques succe		a open arbeablion	23	1	1	0	1	0	5		****/ 873		4.59	4.03	4.04	****
				P		- D-1												
				Frequ	iency	DIS	trib	utio	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 10		Red	guir	ed f	or M	 ajor	 s	3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 8			-			_						3 -		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Gei	nera	1			1	.7	Under-g	rad 3	31	Non-	major	31
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-	2.22 2.00	-	P 0									respons				_	,
				I O		Ot.1	her					0					-	
				? 2		00.						-						

Course-Section: MUSC 261 1 University of Maryland Title Teaching Choral Singin Baltimore County

Jackson,Janice

Instructor:

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

# Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1108

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Questions         NR         NA         1         2         3         4         5         Mean         Rank         Mean					Fre	quer	cies	:		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 1114/1509 4.00 4.66 4.31 4.34 4.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1509 5.00 4.69 4.26 4.32 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1459 5.00 4.64 4.22 4.30 5.00	Questions	NR	N	ΙA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1509 5.00 4.69 4.26 4.32 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1459 5.00 4.64 4.22 4.30 5.00	General															
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1459 5.00 4.64 4.22 4.30 5.00	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1		0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.66	4.31	4.34	4.00
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.32	5.00
	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1		1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned $1$ 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 1333/1406 3.00 4.45 4.09 4.09 3.00	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1		1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.00	4.45	4.09	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 $4.00$ $807/1384$ $4.00$ $4.45$ $4.11$ $4.09$ $4.00$	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1		1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1489 5.00 4.50 4.17 4.19 5.00	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1		1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.17	4.19	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1506 5.00 4.69 4.67 4.61 5.00	8. How many times was class cancelled	1		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $1  0  0  1  1  0  3.50  1241/1463  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.09  4.08  3.50  4.49  4.08$	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1		0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1241/1463	3.50	4.49	4.09	4.08	3.50
Lecture	Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 800/1438 4.50 4.66 4.46 4.48 4.50	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1		0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.66	4.46	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1421 5.00 4.82 4.73 4.76 5.00	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1411 5.00 4.66 4.31 4.37 5.00	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 634/1405 4.50 4.66 4.32 4.39 4.50	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1		0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.66	4.32	4.39	4.50
Discussion	Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 746/1260 4.00 4.57 4.14 4.19 4.00		1		0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.57	4.14	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.75 4.33 4.37 5.00	<del>_</del>	1		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00				4.33	4.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.44 5.00		1		0	0	0	0	0	2		,				4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 209/873 4.50 4.59 4.03 4.04 4.50		1		0	0	0	0	1	1		,				4.04	

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	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	3	Non-major	1
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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	-	-	
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 301 1 University of Maryland Chambers Players MAR 22, 2010 Title Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 1109

Job IRBR3029

Yoshioka, Airi (Instr. A) Instructor:

Enrollment: 17

Ouestionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

I 0

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 8 4.73 339/1509 4.73 4.66 4.31 4.32 4.73 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 7 4.64 390/1509 4.64 4.69 4.26 4.25 4.64 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1287 5.00 4.76 4.30 4.33 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 454/1459 4.50 4.64 4.22 4.26 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 10 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1406 \*\*\*\* 4.45 4.09 4.12 \*\*\*\* 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1384 \*\*\*\* 4.45 4.11 4.15 \*\*\*\* 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 4 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 224/1489 4.71 4.50 4.17 4.14 4.71 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 1118/1506 4.45 4.69 4.67 4.67 4.45 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 248/1463 4.47 4.49 4.09 4.08 4.47 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 9 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/1438 5.00 4.66 4.46 4.43 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 8 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1014/1421 4.83 4.82 4.73 4.73 4.83 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/1411 5.00 4.66 4.31 4.29 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/1405 5.00 4.66 4.32 4.32 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 9 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 1.236 \*\*\*\* 4.45 4.00 4.07 \*\*\*\* Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 308/1260 4.67 4.57 4.14 4.22 4.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.75 4.33 4.37 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.42 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 8 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\* 873 \*\*\*\* 4.59 4.03 4.08 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\* 4.82 4.26 5.00 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\* 4.83 4.31 5.00 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Majors Credits Earned 00-27 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 84-150 2 3.00-3.49 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 в 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 4 D 0 F 0 Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant

Other

Ω

Course-Section: MUSC 301 1 University of Maryland Page 1110
Title Chambers Players Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Ladd, Gita (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 17

r. B) Fall 2009

Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5				5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Dept Mean Mean		UMBC Level Mean Mean				
		Question				IVA						Mean		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1509	4.73	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals				0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	390/1509	4.64	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.64
3. Did the	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	4	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	224/1489	4.71	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.71
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1118/1506	4.45	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.45
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	853/1463	4.47	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.47
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.83	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	***
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	308/1260	4.67	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.67
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
		_		d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	***	4.59	4.03	4.08	***
		Self	Paced															
				what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.82	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were yo	our conta	cts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.83	4.31	5.00	***
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Туј	pe			Majors	1
00 27	 0	0 00 0 00		7 10								7	Candust		0			
00-27 28-55	2	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 10 B 0		кес	4uıre	eu ro	or Ma	Jors	j.	7	Graduate	=	U	Majo	)T	7
28-55 56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gor	neral	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non	major	4
84-150	2	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		Gel	ıcıdı	L				U	onder -g.	Lau I		NOII-	iia jui	4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ela	ectiv	7es				3	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	J	3.30 1.00	5	P 0		11.0	C 1	,			- " " " " " "			Means there are not enough ses to be significant				
				I O		O+1	ner .					0	responses to be significant					
				1 0	Other						•							

Course-Section: MUSC 301 1 University of Maryland Page 1111
Title Chambers Players Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Tremblay, Christ (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 17
Ouestionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Fall 2009

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 8 4.73 339/1509 4.73 4.66 4.31 4.32 4.73 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 4 7 4.64 390/1509 4.64 4.69 4.26 4.25 4.64 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1287 5.00 4.76 4.30 4.33 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 0 0 2 2 4.50 454/1459 4.50 4.64 4.22 4.26 4.50 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 10 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1406 \*\*\*\* 4.45 4.09 4.12 \*\*\*\* 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 10 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1384 \*\*\*\* 4.45 4.11 4.15 \*\*\*\* 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 4 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 224/1489 4.71 4.50 4.17 4.14 4.71 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 6 5 4.45 1118/1506 4.45 4.69 4.67 4.67 4.45 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 209/1463 4.47 4.49 4.09 4.08 4.47 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 308/1260 4.67 4.57 4.14 4.22 4.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1255 5.00 4.75 4.33 4.37 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.42 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 8 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 873 \*\*\*\* 4.59 4.03 4.08 \*\*\*\* Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 49 \*\*\*\* 4.82 4.26 5.00 \*\*\*\* 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 10 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\* 4.83 4.31 5.00 \*\*\*\*

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 301 1 University of Maryland Title Chambers Players Baltimore County

Instructor: Kannen, Maria La (Instr. D)

Enrollment:

17

Questionnaires: 11

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2009

Page 1112

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Questions				NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
Comparel																		
1 Did 110	aain na	Genera w insights,ski		m thia acumac	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1509	4.73	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.73
					0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.73	399/1509	4.73	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.73
	<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>						0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.50
				what you learned	0	7 10	0	0	0	0	1		****/1406		4.45	4.09	4.12	****
	_	-		o what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1		****/1384		4.45	4.11	4.15	****
		system clearly			0	4	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	224/1489	4.71	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.71
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	6	5		1118/1506		4.69	4.67	4.67	4.45
	-			hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	248/1463		4.49	4.09	4.08	4.47
				5														
		Lecture	е															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.83	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did th	e lecture	s contribute to	o what	you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
		Discus																
				what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	308/1260		4.57	4.14	4.22	4.67
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
				d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	sstul		8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.08	****
		g-16	0															
1 5 4	16	Self :			1.0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/ 10	++++	4 00	1 26	г оо	****
		system contrib cts with the i		what you learned	10 10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49 ****/ 46	****	4.82	4.26	5.00 5.00	****
3. Were y	our conta	.ccs with the in	istruct	or neiprui	10	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	/ 40		4.03	4.31	5.00	
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	utior	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	5			Ty	рe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		7	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		~	_					0	1	, ,	-			4
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0 5	D 0 F 0		m 7						3	ишши ,	VI	h			.lo
Grad.	U	3.50-4.00	Э	F 0		F.T.	ectiv	/es				3		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant				
				I 0		O+1	h 0.70					0	respons	es lo E	e sign	iiican	IL	
				1 0		Other						U						

1

Course-Section: MUSC 303 1 University of Maryland Title UMBC Camerata--Chamber

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1113

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 39 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

Caracciolo,Step

						Frequencies							ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	11	0	0	0	1	7	20	4.68	398/1509	4.68	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.68
					11	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	47/1509	4.96	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.96
<ol> <li>Did the instructor make clear the expected goals</li> <li>Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</li> </ol>					11	27	0	0	0	0	1		****/1287	****	4.76	4.30	4.33	****
	_	uations reflect			11	21	0	0	0	2	5		****/1459	****	4.64	4.22	4.26	****
			_	hat you learned	11	25	1	0	0	0	2		****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.12	****
				what you learned	12	23	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.15	****
		g system clearly		-	11	1	0	1	1	1	24	4.78	175/1489	4.78	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.78
		was class cance			11	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	466/1506	4.93	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.93
				ing effectiveness	15	1	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	110/1463	4.83	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.83
	-			_														
		Lecture	9															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	153/1438	4.94	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.94
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem intere	ested in	the subject	23	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	232/1411	4.81	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.81
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what y	rou learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	120/1405	4.94	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.94
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	24	10	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
		Discus	sion															
				hat you learned	22	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	496/1260	4.41	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.41
				l to participate	22	0	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	402/1255	4.71	4.75	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage i	fair and	l open discussion	22	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	650/1258	4.47	4.72	4.38	4.42	4.47
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		23	3	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	173/ 873	4.62	4.59	4.03	4.08	4.62
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utior	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A 23		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	8	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			_			-						_		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 3	9	Non-	major	29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es			1	.1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									#### - Means there are not enoug					
				I 0		Other						2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 304 1 University of Maryland Title UMBC Jubilee Singers Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Jackson, Janice

Instructor: Enrollment: 38

Questionnaires: 38

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2009

Page 1114

Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	2 Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	22	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.50
		ctor make clear			22	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	652/1509	4.44	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.44
		uestions reflec			22	9	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1287	****	4.76	4.30	4.33	****
	_	uations reflect		-	22	9	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	****/1459	***	4.64	4.22	4.26	****
5. Did ass	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	24	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1406	***	4.45	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did wr:	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	24	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	***	4.45	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	24	3	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	527/1489	4.45	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.45
	_	was class canc			24	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1146/1506	4.43	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.43
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	25	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.50
		Lectur	۵															
1 Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	31	0	0	0	1	3	3	4 29	****/1438	****	4.66	4.46	4.43	****
		ctor seem inter		1 1	31	0	0	0	0	0	7		****/1421	****	4.82	4.73	4.73	****
				explained clearly	31	0	0	0	2	1	4		****/1411	****	4.66	4.31	4.29	****
		es contribute t			31	0	0	0	0	2	5		****/1405	****	4.66	4.32	4.32	****
				your understanding	31	4	0	0	0	0	3		****/1236		4.45	4.00	4.07	***
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al.	ann dinn			what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	_	E 00	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	4.22	****
				ed to participate	33	0	0	0	0	0	5		****/1255	****	4.75	4.33	4.37	****
		-	_	nd open discussion	33	0	0	0	0	1	4		****/1258	****	4.72	4.38	4.42	****
		echniques succe		ia open arscussion	33	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 873		4.59	4.03	4.08	****
	_	-																
				Frequ	lency	7 Dist	iribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	•	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 10		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	ior		4	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 )r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2					10		-	-	oz addac	-	-		_	-
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-q	rad 3	38	Non-	-major	34
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								-			-		5 2	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	zes.				6	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	: enouc	rh
	ŭ	2.23 1.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	J==
				I 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 305 1 University of Maryland Page 1115 Title UMBC Community Symphon Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Richards, Edwin

Enrollment: 56 Questionnaires: 52

## Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

						Frequencies I		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 -1															
1 Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,sk:		m this course	3	0	0	1	1	4	43	4.82	235/1509	4.82	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.82
_	_	ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	1	4	45	4.88	133/1509	4.88	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.88
		uestions reflec		_	3	25	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.67
	_	uations reflect		_	2	26	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.67
				what you learned	2	38	0	0	0	2	10		****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.12	****
	_	-		o what you learned	2	40	0	0	0	1	9		****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.15	****
		g system clear!		2	2	10	0	0	3	7	30	4.68	265/1489	4.68	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.68
		was class cand			2	0	0	0	0	1	49	4.98	117/1506		4.69	4.67	4.67	4.98
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	46	4.92	65/1463		4.49	4.09	4.08	4.92
	1 1 1			5														
		Lectu																
		uctor's lecture			42	0	0	0	0	0	10		****/1438	****	4.66	4.46	4.43	****
		ctor seem inter			42	0	0	0	0	0	10		****/1421	****	4.82	4.73	4.73	****
				xplained clearly	42	0	0	0	0	2	8		****/1411	****	4.66	4.31	4.29	****
		es contribute t		-	42	1	0	0	1	0	8		****/1405	****	4.66	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	nhance y	our understanding	41	5	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned	49	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	4.22	****
				d to participate	48	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/1255	****	4.75	4.33	4.37	****
				d open discussion	49	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1258	****	4.72	4.38	4.42	****
		echniques succe		a open alboablen	48	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.08	****
	_	1																
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			ТУ	pe			Majors	1
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 33		Re	 anir	 ed f	or Ma	ior	 g 1	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	18
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		1/6/	datt.	Ju I	O1 140	ـــ	5 1	. 4	Graduat	_	J	1.10 ) (	/ <u>_</u>	10
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad 5	52	Non-	-major	34
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0				_				-	011001 9		-	2.021		
Grad.					#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	h								
	-	2.23 2.00		P 0							_	- =	respons				_	.==
				I O		Ot.1	her					6					-	
				2 1		00.						-						

Course-Section:	MUSC 307 10
Title	Small Ensembl
Instructor:	King, Thomas D
Enrollment:	10

Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1116 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### 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	1	0	4.00	1114/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1086/1509	4.78	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1403/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1392/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.08	3.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	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	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 307 11 Small Ensemble Fall 2009 Instructor: Franklin, Rachel

? 0

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 3

Title

MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Page 1117

Student	Course	Firalization	Ouestionnain	ra

	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	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.78	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	4.88	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
	_	uations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.12	5.00
	_	_		o what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384		4.45	4.11	4.15	5.00
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.14	5.00
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	1	2		941/1506		4.69	4.67	4.67	4.67
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1		853/1463		4.49	4.09	4.08	4.00
	1 1 1			3									,					
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.75	4.45	4.00	4.07	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	4.78	4.57	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were a	.11 stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	4.00	4.59	4.03	4.08	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	iors	 s	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		100	-10-11		02 110	-, -, -, -,	_	-	SIGGGG	_	Ü	.10.50	-	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	3	Non-	major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		00.		_				-	5362 3		-	-1011		_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-	2.22 2.00	=	P 0									respons				_	,
				I O		Ot1	her					0					-	

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1118

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: MUSC 307 2 University of Maryland Title Small Ensemble Belzer,Matthew Instructor:

Enrollment:

9

Questionnaires: 9	St	udent Cour	se	Evalı	uatio	on Qı	uest:	ionna	aire							
					Fre	equei	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. Did you gain new	insights, skills from this cou	rse	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructo	or make clear the expected goa	ls	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	133/1509	4.78	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.89
3. Did the exam ques	stions reflect the expected go	als	0	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	519/1287	4.88	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluat	ions reflect the expected goa	ls	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00
<ol><li>Did assigned read</li></ol>	lings contribute to what you l	earned	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assig	nments contribute to what you	learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	531/1384	4.78	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading s	system clearly explained		0	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you gra	ade the overall teaching effec	tiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	99/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.86
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	or's lectures well prepared		2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructo	or seem interested in the subj	ect	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture mater	rial presented and explained c	learly	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what you learned	d	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance your unders	tanding	2	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	274/1236	4.75	4.45	4.00	4.07	4.50
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	sions contribute to what you 1	earned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1260	4.78	4.57	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students	actively encouraged to parti	cipate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructo	or encourage fair and open dis	cussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special tech	nniques successful		3	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	4.00	4.59	4.03	4.08	5.00
		Freque	ncy	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA Expecte	d Grades				Rea	ason	S			Туј	pe			Majors	<b>s</b>

Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	5
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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 307 3 Small Ensemble Belzer, Matthew Fall 2009 Instructor: Enrollment: 6

2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate

4. Were special techniques successful

Title

Ouestionnaires: 6

Page 1119 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1255 5.00 4.75 4.33 4.37 \*\*\*\*

5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 873 4.00 4.59 4.03 4.08 \*\*\*\*

			Fre	-מוופי	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	IIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1509		4.66	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	4.78	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	4.88	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	979/1459	4.67	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	4.78	4.45	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	674/1489		4.50	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506		4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
-	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		,					
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	U	U	U	U		3	4.75	151/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	***
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.73	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1411		4.66	4.31	4.29	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1405			4.32	4.32	****
<u>-</u>	_	-	-	-	0	0	1		,		4.66			****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/1236	4.75	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	4.78	4.57	4.14	4.22	****
-:	_	•	-	-	-	-	_		, 1200	_ , , 0				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

#### Frequency Distribution

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1258 5.00 4.72 4.38 4.42 \*\*\*\*

0

0 0

5 0

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 307 6	University of	f Maryland	Page 1120
Title	Small Ensemble	Baltimore	County	MAR 22, 2010
Instructor:	Goldstein,Thoma	Fall	2009	Job IRBR3029

Course-Section:	MUSC 307 6	University o	f Maryland	Pa	age 1120
Title	Small Ensemble	Baltimore	County	MAR 2	22, 2010
Instructor:	Goldstein, Thoma	Fall	2009	Job 3	IRBR3029

Enrollment:	5				
Questionnaires:	5	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	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1114/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1509	4.78	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.80
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	4.82	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.83	4.31	5.00	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 307 8
Title Small Ensemble
Instructor: Belzer, Matthew
Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 4

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1121 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.64	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.78	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.88	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.56	4.50	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1205/1506	4.67	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.35	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	558/1260	4.78	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	866/ 873		4.59	4.03	4.08	2.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 308 1

Title UMBC Wind Ensemble

Spece, Richard D

Instructor:

Enrollment: 42 Questionnaires: 42

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1122 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Fvaluation	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Frequencies				Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
			1															
1 Did vou	ı gəin ne	Genera w insights,ski		m this course	7	0	1	0	9	6	19	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.20
		tor make clear			7	0	0	0	3	7	25	4.63			4.69	4.26	4.25	4.63
		estions reflec			7	32	0	0	0	Ó	3		****/1287		4.76	4.30	4.33	****
	_	ations reflect		_	7	29	0	0	0	1	5		****/1459		4.64	4.22	4.26	****
				what you learned	7	33	0	0	1	0	1		****/1406		4.45	4.09	4.12	****
	_	-		o what you learned	7	34	0	0	0	1	0		****/1384		4.45	4.11	4.15	****
		system clearl		-	7	9	1	0	2	2	21	4.62			4.50	4.17	4.14	4.62
		was class canc		IIICa	7	1	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1506		4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	16	2	0	0	0	12	12		325/1463		4.49	4.09	4.08	4.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	30	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
		tor seem inter			28	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1421		4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
				xplained clearly	30	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83			4.66	4.31	4.29	4.83
		s contribute t			31	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91			4.66	4.32	4.32	4.91
				our understanding	28	7	0	0	1	0	6		****/1236		4.45	4.00	4.07	****
J. Dia aaa	*IOVIDUUI	cccinitques cir	ilalice y	our understanding	20	,	J	J	-	Ü	Ü	1.71	, 1230		1.15	1.00	1.07	
1 - 1 - 1	2.1		34	0	1	0	-	-	_	4 10	++++ /1060		4 55	4 7 4	4 00	****		
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							0	1	1	5		****/1260		4.57	4.14	4.22	****
	. Were all students actively encouraged to participat . Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi							0	0	1	6		****/1255		4.75	4.33	4.37	****
		_		d open discussion	34	0	0	0	0	1	7		****/1258		4.72	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succe	ssiul		32	3	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.08	****
		Labora	tory															
2. Were yo	ou provid	ed with adequa	te back	ground information	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were ne	ecessary	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.52	****
		Semina	r															
4. Did pre	esentatio	ns contribute	to what	you learned	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were cr	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear	-	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	5.00	4.06	3.94	****
		Field	Work															
1 Did fie	ald evner			hat you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	4.61	****
	_			uation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48		5.00	4.41	4.34	****
z. Dia you	cicarry	unacibeana yo	ar cvar	uation critcria	11	O	Ü	Ü	O	_	O	1.00	, 10		3.00	1.11	1.51	
		Self			41													
1. Did sel	1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.82	4.26	5.00	****
Fr						Dist	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Per	asons	2			т,	ре			Majors	
Ed			· 															
00-27 6 0.00-0.99 1 A 29 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 3						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	6	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	18
28-55		1.00-1.99		B 3														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General					1	Under-9	rad 4	12	Non-	major	24		
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D 0					_	_								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Electives					1	3	#### -				_	n
				P 0		Ohbara					0	respons	es to b	oe sign	uiicar	ıt		
				I 0		Other						2						

Course-Section: MUSC 315 1 University of Maryland Title Alexander Technique

Questionnaires: 11

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1123

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Salkind, Wendy Fall 2009 Enrollment: 11

0

1

							Frequencies			Inst	ructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 1101	. ~~!~ ~~	Genera w insights,ski	_	n this source	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/15	00	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	192/15		4.82	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.82
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	192/13		4.82	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.82
	_	ations reflect		_	0	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	106/14		4.89	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.89
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	389/14		4.45	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.45
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	278/13		4.60	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.60
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	527/14		4.45	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.45
		was class cance		Lilea	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/15		5.00	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
	-			ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	151/14		4.75	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.75
J. 110W WOO	iia you g	rade the overa.	rr ccaci	iiig circciveness	,	U	O	O	Ü	2	O	1.75	131/11	03	1.75	1.15	1.05	1.00	1.75
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	262/14	38	4.88	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.88
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/14	21	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was led	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear							0	0	1	6	4.86	190/14	11	4.86	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.86
4. Did the	1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	1	6	4.86	228/14	05	4.86	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did aud	diovisual	our understanding	5	2	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	664/12	36	4.00	4.45	4.00	4.07	4.00		
		- ·																	
المالية المالة		Discus		-lane ]	1	0	0	0	0	1	_	1 00	170/10	c 0	1 00	4 57	1 11	4 00	1 00
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6 7	4.86	172/12 1/12		4.86 5.00	4.57 4.75	4.14	4.22	4.86 5.00
				d to participate d open discussion	4 4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	468/12			4.75	4.33	4.37	4.71
		chniques succes		d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5 5	4.71	130/ 8		4.71 4.71			4.42	
4. were sp	peciai te	ciiniques succes	SSLUL		4	U	U	U	U	4	5	4./1	130/ 8	/ 3	4./1	4.59	4.03	4.08	4.71
		Semina	c																
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the	e instruc	tor available :	for ind:	ividual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	92	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did res	search pr	ojects contrib	ate to v	what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did pre	esentatio	ns contribute	to what	you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	92	****	5.00	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were cr	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	93	****	5.00	4.06	3.94	****
	Frequ	iency	r Dist	tribu	ution	1													
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3				Тур	e			Majors	}			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4		Do.	 quire					5	 Gradu			0	Majo		7
	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 4						4urr.e	=u 10	)T MG	LJOE	D	5	Gradu	ale	:	U	Ma JC	,T	,
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							0	Under	-ar	ad 1	1	Non-	major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	General							-	OIIGCI	5+	1	_	1,011		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				3	####	- M	leans t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	P 0			'								s to b			_	•			
					P 0													-	

Other

0

Course-Section: MUSC 318 1 University of Maryland Page 1124 Title Digital Audio Processi Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Wonneberger,Ala

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			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	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	823/1489	4.20	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.49	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5 00	****/1438	****	4.66	4.46	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1421	****	4.82	4.73	4.73	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1411	****	4.66	4.31	4.29	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1405	****	4.66	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	4.22	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1255		4.75	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1258	****	4.72	4.38	4.42	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	1									

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate 0	0 Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad 11	1 Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means th	here are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to be	e significant	
				I	0	Other	0	_	_	
				?	0					

Course-Section: MUSC 321 1 University of Maryland Title Music History I

Instructor: Morin, Joseph C

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 1125 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	482/1509	4.60	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	0	0	3	7	15	4.48	574/1509	4.48	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	500/1287	4.52	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	2	0	1	3	4	15	4.43	569/1459	4.43	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	1	1	0	2	4	17	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	2	0	2	5	7	9	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	1	2	0	1	4	17	4.42	583/1489	4.42	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	15	10	4.40	1166/1506	4.40	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	690/1463	4.20	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	514/1438	4.71	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	794/1421	4.81	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	2	0	4		4.52	592/1411	4.52	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	0	5	14	4.43	733/1405	4.43	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	1	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	330/1236	4.44	4.45	4.00	4.07	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/1260	****	4.57	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	0	1	2	4		****/1255	****	4.75	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	1	5		****/1258	****	4.72	4.38	4.42	****
4. Were special techniques successful	27	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	5.00	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	5.00	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	5.00	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.32	4.40	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 49	****	4.82	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.69	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.83	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.83	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: MUSC 321 1
Title Music History I

Instructor: Morin, Joseph C

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1125 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5 5	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	13
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	2						

Course-Section: MUSC 358 1

University of Maryland

Music In Performance Baltimore County

Morin, Joseph C Fall 2009

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 30

Title

Instructor:

raii 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1126 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	_			_	_	_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	1	3	6	5	9		1304/1509		4.66	4.31	4.32	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	6	7	11	4.21	912/1509	4.21 ****	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7 6	18 2	1	0 1	0 6	3	2 11	4.40	****/1287 979/1459	4.00	4.76 4.64	4.30 4.22	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	4	7	11	4.00	753/1406		4.45	4.22	4.26	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	531/1384		4.45	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	319/1489	4.63	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	15	9		1182/1506	4.38	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	14	4	4.10	799/1463		4.49	4.09	4.08	4.10
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		Ü	Ü	J	_		-	1.10	,,,,,1103	1.10	1.15	1.05	1.00	1.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	675/1438	4.61	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	1	0	0	21	4.70	979/1421	4.70	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	592/1411	4.52	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	2	5		4.27	881/1405	4.27	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	12	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	871/1236	3.73	4.45	4.00	4.07	3.73
Pierwanian														
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	_	0	0	0	1	2	0.1	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6 6	0	0	0	2	4	21 18	4.83	443/1255	4.83	4.75	4.14	4.22	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	212/1258	4.92	4.73	4.38	4.42	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	6	15	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	292/ 873		4.72	4.03	4.42	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	0	13	U	U	4	2	5	4.33	292/ 6/3	4.33	4.33	4.03	4.00	4.33
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.22	4.17	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar	20	0	_	^	0	1	-	4 50	****/ 00		F 00	4 40	4 06	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	Ţ	1	4.50	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	1	0	Ţ	4.00	****/ 92		5.00	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1 1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92		5.00	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	U	U	U	Τ	1	0	3.50	****/ 93	****	5.00	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.18	4.47	****
J	-		-	-		-	-		,					
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	4.82	4.26	5.00	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	1	A	19	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	30	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2				

? 0

Course-Section: MUSC 360 1

Title Sem:K-12 Choral Method

Instructor: Caracciolo, Step

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1127 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ou a stri a sa	_			NTD	377	Fr	_	ncies	5 4	_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Questions	; 			NR 	NA		2 	3 	4	5 	Mean	Rank 	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1																
1. Did	you gain n	lew insights,skil	=	this cour	se	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.33
		ctor make clear				3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	859/1509	4.25	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did	the exam q	uestions reflect	the ex	pected goa	ls	3	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	453/1287	4.57	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.57
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the exp	ected goal	s	2	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	902/1459	4.11	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.11
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contribu	ite to w	hat you le	arned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	152/1406	4.78	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.78
		signments contr			learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.00
		g system clearly		ned		2	0	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	1379/1489	3.22	4.50	4.17	4.14	3.22
	-	was class cance				2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1127/1506	4.44	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.44
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effect	iveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	598/1463	4.29	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.29
		Lecture	9																
1. Were	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.60
2. Did	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clea:						0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	794/1421	4.80	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.80
			6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	496/1411	4.60	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.60			
4. Did	the lectur		6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	758/1405	4.40	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.40			
		Discus	sion																
1. Did	class disc	ussions contribu	ite to w	hat you le	arned	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	352/1260	4.60	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.60
2. Were	all stude	nts actively end	couraged	to partic	ipate	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	505/1255	4.60	4.75	4.33	4.37	4.60
		ctor encourage i		open disc	ussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.72	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were	e special t	echniques succes	ssful			6	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.59	4.03	4.08	4.67
		Semina	£																
1. Were	e assigned	topics relevant	to the	announced	theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was	the instru	ctor available i	for indi	vidual att	ention	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.54	4.67	****
		rojects contrib				9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	5.00	4.50	4.63	****
		ons contribute t		you learne	d	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were	e criteria	for grading made	e clear			9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 93	****	5.00	4.06	3.94	****
		Field V	Vork																
1. Did	field expe	rience contribut	te to wh	at you lea	rned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did	. Did field experience contribute to what you learned . Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria							0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.41	4.34	****
	F							trib	ution	n									
Credits	s Earned	Cum. GPA	Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	\$		
															- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	7	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3	-				-	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	=			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 361 1 University of Maryland Page 1128 Title Sem:K-12 Instru Method Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Vanderbeek,Maxi

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 14

## Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

								T t		G	D t-	TRADA	T 1	G
			Fre	equer	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	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	1	3	8	4.21	921/1509	4.21	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	1	8	4.14	972/1509	4.14	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	795/1287	4.23	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	11	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	0	1	9	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	2	4	3.43	1335/1489	3.43	4.50	4.17	4.14	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	807/1506	4.79	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	983/1463	3.90	4.49	4.09	4.08	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1166/1438	4.11	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	846/1421	4.78	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	911/1411	4.22	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	994/1405	4.11	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	157/1260	4.88	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1258	4.88	4.72	4.38	4.42	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.59	4.03	4.08	4.67
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıtior	ı									

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 362 1 Title

Arts In Education

Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 4

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1129 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	-anei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	•				•	_	_		000/4500			4 04		4 ==
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1509		4.66	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	256/1509	4.18	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	4.80	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459		4.64	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1		813/1406		4.45	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1		619/1384		4.45	4.11	4.15	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	1		760/1489	4.00	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2			1070/1506		4.69	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	545/1463	4.37	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1438	4.72	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421		4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	617/1411		4.66	4.31	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1405		4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1236		4.45	4.00	4.07	5.00
									_,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260		4.57	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1255		4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	4.92	4.59	4.03	4.08	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	5.00	4.16	4.07	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	5.00	4.22	4.17	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 184		5.00	4.48	4.52	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 177		5.00	4.36	4.30	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 165	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.11	5.00
Seminar	_						_			- 00				
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 89	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.86	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92		5.00	4.54	4.67	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 90		5.00	4.50	4.63	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 92		5.00	4.38	4.73	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 93	5.00	5.00	4.06	3.94	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.39	4.61	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.34	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.62	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.47	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.32	4.40	5.00
Self Paced	_													
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.82	4.26	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41		4.69	4.14	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 46		4.83	4.31	5.00	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.83	4.05	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.27	5.00	5.00

Course-Section: MUSC 362 1
Title Arts In Education
Instructor: Yoshioka, Airi

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1129 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 362 1 Title Arts In Education Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi Fall 2009

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 13

4. Were special techniques successful

Page 1130 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Tnst	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 from this course	0	0	Λ	0	1	7	_	4.31	833/1509	4.53	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	2	4		1326/1509		4.69	4.26	4.25	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	426/1287	4.80	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.60
-	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.38	638/1459	4.44	4.76	4.22	4.26	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2		0	4.62	261/1406		4.45	4.22	4.12	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	-	0	0	•	0	2	8							
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	/	4.38	466/1384		4.45	4.11	4.15	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	Ţ	Τ	Ţ	3	2	5		1197/1489		4.50	4.17	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	3		1273/1506		4.69	4.67	4.67	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	467/1463	4.37	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	Ω	Λ	Λ	2	1	6	4.44	878/1438	4.72	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	7		1014/1421	4.83	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.33	810/1411	4.42	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	5		828/1405	4.67	4.66	4.32		
<del>-</del>	6	1	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	809/1236					
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	О	Т	U	Т	Τ	2	4	3.83	809/1236	4.42	4.45	4.00	4.07	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	Λ	Λ	Ω	Λ	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.92	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255		4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.73	4.38	4.42	5.00
5. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	_	0	U	U	U	0	6	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4./2	4.38	4.42	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

#### Frequency Distribution

7 0 0 0 0 1 5 4.83 87/873 4.92 4.59 4.03 4.08 4.83

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 380 1 University of Maryland Page 1131
Title Intro To Conducting Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Love, Jason L

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 31

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

		Ouestion		ND	NA	Fre		ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Quescion	.5															
		Genera	.1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	17	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	127/1509	4.93	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.93
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	17	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	17	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1287		4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	17	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00
				what you learned	17	8	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	18	4	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	132/1384	4.78	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.78
		system clearl		ined	17	1	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	781/1489	4.23	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.23
		was class cand			17	0	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	1357/1506	4.07	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.07
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	.ll teac	hing effectiveness	22	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	286/1463	4.56	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.56
		Lectur																
1. Were th			26	0	0	0	0	0	5		****/1438			4.46	4.43	****		
		tor seem inter			26	0	0	0	0	0	5		****/1421	****	4.82	4.73	4.73	****
				xplained clearly	26	0	0	0	0	0	5		****/1411	****	4.66	4.31	4.29	****
		s contribute t			26	0	0	0	0	0			****/1405		4.66	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	26	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.07	****
		Discus									_							
				what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	5		****/1260		4.57	4.14	4.22	****
				d to participate	26	0	0	0	0	0	5		****/1255		4.75	4.33	4.37	****
		_		d open discussion	26	0	0	0	0	0	5		****/1258		4.72	4.38	4.42	
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssiul		26	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.08	****
				P		- D.			_									
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	tribu	ıtıoı	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Re	guire		or Ma	 aior	 s 1	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			9411		J	w ) 0 =		_	OZ dadao	_	Ü	110000	-	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge:	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 3	1	Non-	major	20
84-150	_ 5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0								-	3	0			5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		El	ectiv	res				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	h
	-		-	P 0		_							respons				_	
				I 0		Ot:	her					0			J			
				? 0			-											

Course-Section: MUSC 390 1 University
Title Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A Baltimor

Instructor: Franklin, Rachel

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 1132 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			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	1	5.00	1/1509	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.75	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.67	4.45	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.67	4.45	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.67	4.50	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.75	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.75	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.75	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.75	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.75	4.57	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255		4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258		4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873		4.59	4.03	4.08	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	1	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	•	_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 390 10	University of Maryland	Page 1133
Title Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010
Instructor: Kannen, Maria La	Fall 2009	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	1/1509	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.75	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.67	4.45	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.67	4.45	4.11	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.67	4.50	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.75	4.49	4.09	4.08	5.00

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	0	Required for Majors	1	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	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 390 13 Title

Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A

Instructor: Dunlap,Matthew

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1134 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	1	5.00	1/1509	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.75	4.49	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.75	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.75	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.75	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.75	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.67	4.45	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.75	4.57	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.75	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.75	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	1	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	1	Non-major	0	
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	L	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	0					
				2	Ο							

Course-Section: MUSC 390 33 University of Maryland
Title Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A Baltimore County

Title Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A Baltimore County Instructor: Ruas,Laura Mari Fall 2009

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1

_				
1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1114/1509	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.32	4.0
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1086/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.25	4.0
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1287	4.75	4.76	4.30	4.33	4.
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	979/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.26	4.
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	813/1406	4.67	4.45	4.09	4.12	4.
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	807/1384	4.67	4.45	4.11	4.15	4.
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	986/1489	4.67	4.50	4.17	4.14	4.
B. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.67	4.
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.75	4.49	4.09	4.08	4.
Lecture														
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1203/1438	4.75	4.66	4.46	4.43	4.
. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1345/1421	4.75	4.82	4.73	4.73	4.
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1051/1411	4.75	4.66	4.31	4.29	4.
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1405	4.75	4.66	4.32	4.32	4.
. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	664/1236	4.67	4.45	4.00	4.07	4.
Discussion														
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	746/1260	4.75	4.57	4.14	4.22	4.
. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	904/1255	4.75	4.75	4.33	4.37	4.
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	932/1258	4.75	4.72	4.38	4.42	4.
1. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	442/ 873	4.67	4.59	4.03	4.08	4.
Frequ	ency	Dis	crib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3

Page 1135

MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 390 7 University of Maryland Title Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A Baltimore County

Instructor: Markovic-Prakas

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1136

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Questions			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	1/1509	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.80	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.75	4.76	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.26	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.80	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.75	4.49	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.75	4.66	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.75	4.82	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.75	4.66	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.75	4.66	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.67	4.45	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.75	4.57	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.75	4.75	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.75	4.72	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	4.67	4.59	4.03	4.08	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	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	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Baltimore County

Fall 2009

Page 1137

Course-Section: MUSC 400 4 University of Maryland Title Special Projects MAR 22, 2010 Wonneberger,Ala Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	2					
Questionnaires:	2	St	udent	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Enrollment:

	Frequencies							Instr	uctor	Course Dept		-		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	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.45	4.09	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.45	4.11	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.17	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.49	4.09	4.18	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	4.03	5.00
From	onar	. Dia	-vih	u+ i o	2									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 417 1 University of Maryland Title Spec Tpcs In Musc Tech

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 1138

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Wonneberger,Ala Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

Questions								-	ncie		_		tructor		e Dept		Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did voi	u qain ne	w insights,ski	_	this course	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.66	4.31	4.39	4.80
		tor make clear			4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1509		4.69	4.26	4.26	4.80
		estions reflect			4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	208/1287		4.76	4.30	4.38	4.80
		ations reflect			4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	146/1459	4.80	4.64	4.22	4.32	4.80
5. Did ass	d assigned readings contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	135/1406	4.80	4.45	4.09	4.11	4.80
6. Did wr	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned					1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1384	4.75	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.75
7. Was the	Was the grading system clearly explained						0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1489	4.80	4.50	4.17	4.18	4.80
8. How man	. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1463	****	4.49	4.09	4.18	****
	Lecture																	
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture:	repared	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1438	****	4.66	4.46	4.50	****	
2. Did the	e instruc	ructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1421	****	4.82	4.73	4.76	****
3. Was led	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1411	****	4.66	4.31	4.35	****
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1405		4.66	4.32	4.34	****
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	ur understanding	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1236	****	4.45	4.00	4.03	****
		Discus																
				hat you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1260		4.57	4.14	4.25	****
				to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1255		4.75	4.33	4.46	****
				open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1258		4.72	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.59	4.03	4.26	****
				Free	quency	Dis	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	5			Rea	ason	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quire	ed fo	or Ma	aiors	. – – –	3	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		ICC	quii	ca r	JI 140	<i>x</i> J O I C	,	3	Graduat	C	O	Maje	,_	-
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	5
84-150					00	C- U-	-				J	onacr 9		-	1,011		3	
Grad.						Εl	ectiv	ves				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enone	rh
0100.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0											-	respons				_	,
I O					Ot.	her					0					-		
	? 0										-							
	? 0																	

Course-Sec	tion: MUSC 418 1	University of Maryland	Page 1139
Title	Music Tech. Internship	Baltimore County	MAR 22, 2010

Wonneberger,Ala Fall 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 6

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

							Frequencies							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	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.39	5.00						
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.26	5.00						
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.38	5.00						
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.64	4.22	4.32	5.00						
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.45	4.09	4.11	****						
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.45	4.11	4.23	****						
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.17	4.18	5.00						
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00						
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.49	4.09	4.18	4.50						

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	3	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	6	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 not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 480 1 University of Maryland Title Topic in Music, Art &

P

I ?

0

0

1

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Instructor: Dusman,Linda J

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1140

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  1. Did 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 1251/1509 3.86 4.66 4.31 4.39 3.8  2. Did 1 2 1 3 3.86 1251/1509 3.71 4.69 4.26 4.26 3.3  3. Did 1 3 2 3.71 1283/1509 3.71 4.69 4.26 4.26 3.3  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1. Did 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 1251/1509 3.86 4.66 4.31 4.39 3.8  4. Did 0 1 3 3.86 1251/1509 3.86 4.66 4.31 4.39 3.8  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1. Did 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 1251/1509 3.86 4.66 4.31 4.39 3.8  4. Did 0 1 3 3.86 1251/1509 3.86 4.66 4.31 4.39 3.8  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  1. Did 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 1251/1509 3.86 4.66 4.31 4.39 3.8  5. Did 3. Did 4.64 4.22 4.32 3.8  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1. Did 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 1251/1509 3.86 4.66 4.31 4.39 3.8  5. Did 3. Did 4.64 4.22 4.32 3.8  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1. Did 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 1251/1509 3.86 4.66 4.31 4.39 3.8  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  1. Did 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 1251/1509 3.86 4.66 4.31 4.39 3.8  6. Did 0 1 2 2 2 0 3 3.57 1159/1384 3.57 4.45 4.11 4.23 3.8
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 1251/1509 3.86 4.66 4.31 4.39 3.8 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 0 1 3 2 3.71 1283/1509 3.71 4.69 4.26 4.26 3.3 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 5 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1168/1287 3.50 4.76 4.30 4.38 3.4 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 2 1 1 3 3.71 1212/1459 3.71 4.64 4.22 4.32 3.5 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 971/1406 3.86 4.45 4.09 4.11 3.6
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 1251/1509 3.86 4.66 4.31 4.39 3.8 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 0 1 3 2 3.71 1283/1509 3.71 4.69 4.26 4.26 3.3 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 5 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1168/1287 3.50 4.76 4.30 4.38 3.4 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 2 1 1 3 3.71 1212/1459 3.71 4.64 4.22 4.32 3.5 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 971/1406 3.86 4.45 4.09 4.11 3.6
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 1 0 1 3 2 3.71 1283/1509 3.71 4.69 4.26 4.26 3.3 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 5 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1168/1287 3.50 4.76 4.30 4.38 3.4 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 2 1 1 3 3.71 1212/1459 3.71 4.64 4.22 4.32 3.5 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 971/1406 3.86 4.45 4.09 4.11 3.6
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 5 0 1 0 0 1 3.50 1168/1287 3.50 4.76 4.30 4.38 3.4 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 2 1 1 3 3.71 1212/1459 3.71 4.64 4.22 4.32 3.5 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 971/1406 3.86 4.45 4.09 4.11 3.6
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 2 1 1 3 3.71 1212/1459 3.71 4.64 4.22 4.32 3.5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 971/1406 3.86 4.45 4.09 4.11 3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1 2 1 3 3.86 971/1406 3.86 4.45 4.09 4.11 3.8
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 3 0 1 0 1 2 4.00 986/1489 4.00 4.50 4.17 4.18 4.0
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1506 5.00 4.69 4.67 4.67 5.0
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 2 2 2 4.00 853/1463 4.00 4.49 4.09 4.18 4.0
Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 1 2 0 1 3.25 1393/1438 3.25 4.66 4.46 4.50 3.3
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 881/1421 4.75 4.82 4.73 4.76 4.
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 1 2 0 1 3.25 1333/1411 3.25 4.66 4.31 4.35 3.3
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 2 0 1 3.25 1321/1405 3.25 4.66 4.32 4.34 3.3
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 0 3 0 1 3.50 984/1236 3.50 4.45 4.00 4.03 3.
Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 505/1260 4.40 4.57 4.14 4.25 4. $\cdot$
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate $3$ 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.80 287/1255 4.80 4.75 4.33 4.46 4.8
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 1 1 0 3 4.00 932/1258 4.00 4.72 4.38 4.51 4.0
4. Were special techniques successful 3 3 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 801/873 3.00 4.59 4.03 4.26 3.0
Frequency Distribution
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 Required for Majors 6 Graduate 0 Major '
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 8 Non-major 3
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 1 D 0
Grad. 0 $3.50-4.00$ 3 F 0 Electives 1 $\#\#\#$ - Means there are not enough

Other

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 492 3 Page 1141 Title Senior Project MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Instructor: Wonneberger,Ala Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 1

Ouestionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionn	Ouestionnaires:	1	Student Course	e Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
---	-----------------	---	----------------	--------------	---------------

			Frequencies					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	1	0	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.66	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.69	4.26	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.76	4.30	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.64	4.22	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.45	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.45	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.50	4.17	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.67	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.66	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1345/1421	4.00	4.82	4.73	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.66	4.31	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.66	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.45	4.00	4.03	4.00

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

#### Course-Section: MUSC 690 1 University of Maryland Page 1142 Title Sem: Amer Chamber Musi Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 1

## Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Questions			Frequencies 1 2 3			5 4	5	Instructor Mean Rank		Course Dept Mean Mean				Sect Mean
1														
General			0	0	^	0	-1	F 00	1 /1 500	F 00	1	4 21	4 20	г оо
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Ü	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.49	4.09	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.33	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.50	5.00

Credits	Earned	ed Cum. GPA			Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	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	0	Non-major	1	
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 significant				
				I	0	Other	0					
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 693 1 University of Maryland Page 1143 Title Solo Performance Study Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 1

## Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions			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	1/1509	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.69	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.49	4.09	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.66	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.82	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.66	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.66	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.45	4.00	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.57	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.75	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.72	4.38	4.50	5.00

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	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	0	Non-major	1
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	Λ						