

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	44	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	643/1670	4.22	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	44	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	366/1666	4.55	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	44	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	247/1406	4.69	4.82	4.32	4.31	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	44	5	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	****/1615	3.50	4.77	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	44	3	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	****/1566	4.19	4.56	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	44	5	3	3	2	0	4	2.92	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	44	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	615/1650	4.53	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	44	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	405/1667	4.92	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	45	0	0	0	5	8	3	3.88	1152/1626	3.92	4.54	4.11	4.07	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	44	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	503/1559	4.58	4.81	4.46	4.47	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	44	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	929/1560	4.75	4.93	4.72	4.68	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	44	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	658/1549	4.41	4.82	4.31	4.32	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	545/1546	4.37	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	45	10	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/1323	3.79	4.57	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	55	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1384	3.59	4.53	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	55	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/1378	3.42	4.63	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	56	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	****/1378	3.81	4.70	4.31	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 5	Under-grad 61 Non-major 61
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other 0	

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NA		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	15	0	4	4	15	20	29	3.92	1331/1670	4.22	4.74	4.31	4.23	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	15	0	1	0	11	17	43	4.40	784/1666	4.55	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	16	0	0	0	8	15	48	4.56	535/1406	4.69	4.82	4.32	4.31	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	15	46	2	1	12	4	7	3.50	1448/1615	3.50	4.77	4.24	4.17	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	15	4	3	3	11	12	39	4.19	706/1566	4.19	4.56	4.07	4.03	4.19
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	16	54	0	0	9	4	4	3.71	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	15	0	0	1	8	11	52	4.58	457/1650	4.53	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	15	7	1	0	1	1	62	4.89	693/1667	4.92	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	33	2	0	1	11	29	11	3.96	1021/1626	3.92	4.54	4.11	4.07	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	1	11	15	39	4.39	1032/1559	4.58	4.81	4.46	4.47	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	5	8	56	4.74	985/1560	4.75	4.93	4.72	4.68	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	20	0	1	0	13	18	35	4.28	952/1549	4.41	4.82	4.31	4.32	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	4	4	2	11	14	33	4.09	1106/1546	4.37	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	31	1	6	5	8	13	3.79	903/1323	3.79	4.57	4.00	3.91	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	60	0	3	1	8	7	8	3.59	1061/1384	3.59	4.53	4.10	3.92	3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	61	0	5	1	7	4	9	3.42	1221/1378	3.42	4.63	4.29	4.09	3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	61	0	2	2	6	5	11	3.81	1086/1378	3.81	4.70	4.31	4.08	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	62	12	2	2	7	0	2	2.85	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	85	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	85	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	85	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.00	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	85	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	85	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	85	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.95	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	85	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	85	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	85	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	85	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.90	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	85	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	3.00	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	85	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	85	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	85	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	85	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	85	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 28	****	4.78	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	85	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	85	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.86	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	85	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	85	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0201
Title: FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS
Enrollment: 87
Questionnaires: 87

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2008

Page 1118
AUG 6, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	62	Required for Majors	45	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	11	C	2	General	14	Under-grad	87	Non-major	86
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	16	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	20	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	363/1670	4.78	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	198/1666	4.91	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	212/1406	4.84	4.82	4.32	4.31	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	238/1615	4.84	4.77	4.24	4.17	4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	491/1566	4.57	4.56	4.07	4.03	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	361/1528	4.40	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	406/1650	4.56	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	1583/1667	4.03	4.58	4.67	4.61	3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	191/1626	4.62	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	647/1560	4.94	4.93	4.72	4.68	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	326/1323	4.75	4.57	4.00	3.91	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	285/1384	4.69	4.53	4.10	3.92	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.93	4.63	4.29	4.09	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	608/1378	4.45	4.70	4.31	4.08	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	417/ 904	4.58	4.72	4.03	3.94	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 111 0201
 Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB II
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1120
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	290/1670	4.78	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	121/1666	4.91	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	261/1406	4.84	4.82	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	203/1615	4.84	4.77	4.24	4.17	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	226/1566	4.57	4.56	4.07	4.03	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	733/1528	4.40	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	570/1650	4.56	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	10	4	4.13	1458/1667	4.03	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	467/1626	4.62	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.46

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	4.94	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1323	4.75	4.57	4.00	3.91	5.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	324/1384	4.69	4.53	4.10	3.92	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	4.93	4.63	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	813/1378	4.45	4.70	4.31	4.08	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/904	4.58	4.72	4.03	3.94	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0601
Title MUSIC REPERTOIRE
Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2008

Page 1121
AUG 6, 2008
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	516/1666	4.58	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.77	4.24	4.17	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1566	****	4.56	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	4	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	631/1528	4.33	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	844/1650	4.30	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	1472/1667	4.10	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1559	****	4.81	4.46	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1560	****	4.93	4.72	4.68	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1549	****	4.82	4.31	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1546	****	4.81	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				Other	9				

Course-Section: MUSC 126 0101
 Title THEORY II:FORM&ANALYSI
 Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1122
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	271/1670	4.36	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	516/1666	4.26	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	240/1406	4.56	4.82	4.32	4.31	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	224/1615	4.55	4.77	4.24	4.17	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	643/1566	4.09	4.56	4.07	4.03	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	600/1528	4.21	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	705/1650	4.21	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1127/1667	4.68	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	308/1626	4.04	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1559	4.31	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	4.79	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	366/1549	4.02	4.82	4.31	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1546	4.50	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	144/1323	4.27	4.57	4.00	3.91	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	General	0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P			
			I	Other	10	
			?			

Course-Section: MUSC 126 0201
 Title THEORY II:FORM&ANALYSI
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1123
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	1	4	5	7	3.89	1358/1670	4.36	4.74	4.31	4.23	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	0	4	7	6	3.94	1270/1666	4.26	4.71	4.27	4.30	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	860/1406	4.56	4.82	4.32	4.31	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	861/1615	4.55	4.77	4.24	4.17	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	978/1566	4.09	4.56	4.07	4.03	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	870/1528	4.21	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	4	3	9	4.00	1135/1650	4.21	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	823/1667	4.68	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	1	6	2	2	3.45	1411/1626	4.04	4.54	4.11	4.07	3.45

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1442/1559	4.31	4.81	4.46	4.47	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1188/1560	4.79	4.93	4.72	4.68	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1453/1549	4.02	4.82	4.31	4.32	3.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1139/1546	4.50	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	936/1323	4.27	4.57	4.00	3.91	3.71

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0	
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other		17
			? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 170 0101
 Title BEGINNING VOICE CLASS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1124
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	440/1670	4.69	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	301/1666	4.77	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	4	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	281/1615	4.77	4.77	4.24	4.17	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1144/1566	3.75	4.56	4.07	4.03	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	4	0	0	4	0	5	4.11	832/1528	4.11	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	630/1650	4.46	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	540/1667	4.92	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	670/1626	4.30	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	435/1559	4.80	4.81	4.46	4.47	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	911/1560	4.78	4.93	4.72	4.68	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	337/1549	4.78	4.82	4.31	4.32	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	655/1546	4.56	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 0						

Course-Section: MUSC 171 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE VOICE CLA
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1125
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.82	4.32	4.31	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1032/1650	4.14	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1458/1667	4.13	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	131/1626	4.88	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	739/1559	4.63	4.81	4.46	4.47	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	948/1560	4.75	4.93	4.72	4.68	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.82	4.31	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	273/1323	4.60	4.57	4.00	3.91	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.53	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.63	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.70	4.31	4.08	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	146/ 904	4.75	4.72	4.03	3.94	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 172B 0101
 Title DICTION
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1126
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	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	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 173 0101
 Title INTRO TO CHORAL SINGIN
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1127
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1566/1670	3.40	4.74	4.31	4.23	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	706/1566	4.20	4.56	4.07	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	4.75	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1157/1559	4.25	4.81	4.46	4.47	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.53	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.70	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 175 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE VOCAL MET
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1128
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	902/1670	4.33	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1452/1666	3.67	4.71	4.27	4.30	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	****	4.82	4.32	4.31	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1650	****	4.50	4.22	4.28	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1648/1667	3.50	4.58	4.67	4.61	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1461/1559	3.50	4.81	4.46	4.47	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1248/1560	4.50	4.93	4.72	4.68	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.82	4.31	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 178B 0101
 Title BEGIN KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1129
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	401/1670	4.72	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1666	4.79	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1406	4.75	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1615	4.75	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566	4.50	4.56	4.07	4.03	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	560/1528	4.30	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	429/1650	4.57	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	675/1667	4.88	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1416/1626	3.77	4.54	4.11	4.07	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1560	4.80	4.93	4.72	4.68	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1546	4.60	4.81	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.35	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.00	4.44	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.95	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.46	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.90	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.00	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.78	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.86	4.54	4.46	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	4.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	4.83	****

Course-Section: MUSC 178B 0101
 Title BEGIN KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1129
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 178B 0201
 Title BEGIN KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1130
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	414/1670	4.72	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	529/1666	4.79	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	6	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	597/1406	4.75	4.82	4.32	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	2	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	552/1615	4.75	4.77	4.24	4.17	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	706/1566	4.50	4.56	4.07	4.03	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	760/1528	4.30	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	527/1650	4.57	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	768/1667	4.88	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	900/1626	3.77	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.93	4.72	4.68	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0101
 Title INTER KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1131
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	531/1670	4.51	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1666	4.97	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	903/1650	4.52	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	730/1667	4.87	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	403/1626	4.14	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	****	4.81	4.46	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1560	****	4.93	4.72	4.68	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	****	4.82	4.31	4.32	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.08	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	4.78	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.86	4.54	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	7				
				? 0						

Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0201
 Title INTER KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1132
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	4	1	10	4.40	809/1670	4.51	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	121/1666	4.97	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	7	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	4	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	9	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	246/1650	4.52	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	749/1667	4.87	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1240/1626	4.14	4.54	4.11	4.07	3.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1559	****	4.81	4.46	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1560	****	4.93	4.72	4.68	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1549	****	4.82	4.31	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1546	****	4.81	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	3.94	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	4.78	4.64	4.59	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.86	4.54	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0101
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1133
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	902/1670	4.37	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	622/1666	4.55	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	515/1406	4.73	4.82	4.32	4.31	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	317/1615	4.73	4.77	4.24	4.17	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	6	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1373/1566	3.58	4.56	4.07	4.03	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	10	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	1090/1650	4.18	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1124/1626	3.90	4.54	4.11	4.07	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	971/1559	4.58	4.81	4.46	4.47	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	4.86	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	488/1549	4.65	4.82	4.31	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	382/1546	4.67	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	235/1323	4.43	4.57	4.00	3.91	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	3.94	****
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	2							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		4	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0201
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1134
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	1	1	1	0	12	4.40	809/1670	4.37	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	490/1666	4.55	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	219/1406	4.73	4.82	4.32	4.31	4.87	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	4	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	317/1615	4.73	4.77	4.24	4.17	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	9	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1078/1566	3.58	4.56	4.07	4.03	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	13	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	2	2	1	10	4.27	891/1650	4.18	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	1	7	2	3.91	1124/1626	3.90	4.54	4.11	4.07	3.91

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	589/1559	4.58	4.81	4.46	4.47	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	1023/1560	4.86	4.93	4.72	4.68	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	512/1549	4.65	4.82	4.31	4.32	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	631/1546	4.67	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	590/1323	4.43	4.57	4.00	3.91	4.20

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 181 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE PIANO CLA
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1135
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	440/1670	4.70	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.82	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	429/1650	4.60	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1335/1626	3.63	4.54	4.11	4.07	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.93	4.72	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1549	4.88	4.82	4.31	4.32	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	265/1546	4.88	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	183/1323	4.75	4.57	4.00	3.91	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.53	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.63	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.70	4.31	4.08	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	3.94	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.35	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.95	4.65	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.45	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.90	3.97	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.00	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.78	4.64	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	Major 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Non-major 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	
				P 0	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	1
?	0		

Course-Section: MUSC 184 0101
 Title BEGINNING WOODWIND CLA
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1136
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	518/1670	4.64	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	344/1666	4.73	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.82	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	272/1615	4.78	4.77	4.24	4.17	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	645/1650	4.45	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1416/1667	4.18	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.81	4.46	4.47	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.86	4.93	4.72	4.68	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.82	4.31	4.32	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.86	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.57	4.00	3.91	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.53	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.63	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.70	4.31	4.08	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	202/ 904	4.60	4.72	4.03	3.94	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13	Non-major 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 8		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 185 0101
 Title INTERM WOODWIND CLASS
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1137
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1566	****	4.56	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	429/1650	4.60	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 189 0101
 Title GUITAR CLASS
 Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1138
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	3	1	0	4	8	3.81	1407/1670	3.81	4.74	4.31	4.23	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	340/1406	4.73	4.82	4.32	4.31	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	217/1615	4.85	4.77	4.24	4.17	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.56	4.07	4.03	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	10	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1528	4.83	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	429/1650	4.60	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	1	12	1	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	670/1626	4.31	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.31

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	996/1559	4.43	4.81	4.46	4.47	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	1023/1560	4.71	4.93	4.72	4.68	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.82	4.31	4.32	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	679/1546	4.54	4.81	4.32	4.32	4.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	9	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.91	****

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	0	0	2	2.80	1308/1384	2.80	4.53	4.10	3.92	2.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.63	4.29	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1086/1378	3.80	4.70	4.31	4.08	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0201
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1139
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	922/1667	4.75	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 239	5.00	5.00	4.21	4.35	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	188/ 230	4.00	4.00	4.44	4.58	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 231	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.45	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	22/ 28	4.67	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.83	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	17/ 27	4.67	4.86	4.54	4.46	4.67
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 10	5.00	5.00	4.84	4.75	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 6	5.00	5.00	4.92	4.83	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1140
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.50	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.59	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	4.86	4.54	4.46	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	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	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0201
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1141
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	4.50	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190C 0101
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: TREMBLAY, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1142
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	922/1667	4.75	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.59	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 16	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.83	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	19/ 27	4.50	4.86	4.54	4.46	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190E 0101
 Title CELLO
 Instructor: LADD, GITA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1143
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190F 0101
 Title ELECTRIC GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1144
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190G 0101
 Title CLASSICAL GUITAR
 Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1145
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.57	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.53	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.70	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.72	4.03	3.94	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190I 0201
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: KESNER, LORI
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1146
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	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	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	1			
				? 0					

Course-Section: MUSC 190K 0101
 Title CLARINET
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1147
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.77	4.24	4.17	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.33	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	3	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 responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	0				
				? 0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190K 0201
 Title CLARINET
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1148
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.33	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.57	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.53	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.70	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.72	4.03	3.94	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 1900 0101
 Title RECORDER
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1149
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1460/1650	3.50	4.50	4.22	4.28	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.50

Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.59	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	4.86	4.54	4.46	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190S 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1150
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	4.75	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190S 0201
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: HUMPHREYS, MICH
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1151
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.75	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.53	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.70	4.31	4.08	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190U 0101
 Title HARP
 Instructor: POLLAUF, JACQUE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1152
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0301
 Title RECITAL PREPARATION
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1153
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	19	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	****/1670	****	4.74	4.31	4.23	****
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	19	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1666	****	4.71	4.27	4.30	****
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	19	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1406	****	4.82	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	19	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1615	****	4.77	4.24	4.17	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	19	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1566	****	4.56	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	19	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	19	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1650	****	4.50	4.22	4.28	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	19	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1667	****	4.58	4.67	4.61	****
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1626	****	4.54	4.11	4.07	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	****	4.81	4.46	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1560	****	4.93	4.72	4.68	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	****	4.82	4.31	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1546	****	4.81	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1154
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.57	4.00	3.91	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	1 Under-grad 2 Non-major 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0201
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1155
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1670	4.75	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1666	4.75	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1626	4.75	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	1.00	4.57	4.00	3.91	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0301
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1156
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	665/1670	4.75	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	622/1666	4.75	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.00	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.75	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1318/1323	1.00	4.57	4.00	3.91	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.53	4.10	3.92	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.70	4.31	4.08	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	23/ 28	4.00	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	4.86	4.54	4.46	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 10	5.00	5.00	4.84	4.75	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	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	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193C 0101
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: TREMBLAY, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1157
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.57	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.53	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.70	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.72	4.03	3.94	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193F 0101
 Title GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1158
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.82	4.32	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.77	4.24	4.17	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1566	****	4.56	4.07	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	****	4.81	4.46	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1560	****	4.93	4.72	4.68	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	****	4.82	4.31	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1546	****	4.81	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	3.92	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.08	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 8	Non-major 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	1		
				? 0				

Course-Section: MUSC 193G 0101
 Title CLASSICAL GUITAR
 Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1159
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1310/1667	4.33	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193I 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1160
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.74	4.31	4.23	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.57	4.00	3.91	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	38/ 41	3.00	3.00	4.50	3.91	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 3	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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 193K 0101
 Title CLARINET
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1161
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.53	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.70	4.31	4.08	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 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	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 193S 0201
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: HUMPHREYS, MICH
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1162
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193W 0201
 Title UPRIGHT BASS
 Instructor: RUAS, LAURA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1163
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194A 0201
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1164
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.78	4.64	4.59	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	4.86	4.54	4.46	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 10	5.00	5.00	4.84	4.75	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1165
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194F 0101
 Title GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1166
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	4.82	4.32	4.31	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1384/1626	3.50	4.54	4.11	4.07	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194I 0201
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: KESNER, LORI
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1167
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	1	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 responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	0				
				? 0						

Course-Section: MUSC 194Q 0201
 Title SAXOPHONE
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1168
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1580/1650	3.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 194S 0201
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: HUMPHREYS, MICH
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1169
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.03	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.32	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 211 0101
 Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB IV
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1170
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	505/1670	4.65	4.74	4.31	4.32	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	366/1666	4.71	4.71	4.27	4.27	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	340/1406	4.73	4.82	4.32	4.39	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	520/1615	4.53	4.77	4.24	4.29	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1566	4.83	4.56	4.07	4.00	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1528	4.83	4.60	4.12	4.11	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	690/1650	4.43	4.50	4.22	4.20	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1097/1667	4.59	4.58	4.67	4.64	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	167/1626	4.80	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	772/1559	4.60	4.81	4.46	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1163/1560	4.60	4.93	4.72	4.73	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.82	4.31	4.25	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	595/1546	4.60	4.81	4.32	4.30	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 214 0101
 Title HIST JAZZ: ORIGINS-PRE
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 85
 Questionnaires: 85

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1171
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	45	0	2	0	4	17	17	4.18	1082/1670	4.18	4.74	4.31	4.32	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	45	0	1	1	6	14	18	4.18	1059/1666	4.18	4.71	4.27	4.27	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	45	0	1	1	4	13	21	4.30	836/1406	4.30	4.82	4.32	4.39	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	45	27	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	****/1615	****	4.77	4.24	4.29	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	45	0	2	0	8	16	14	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.56	4.07	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	45	30	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	45	0	0	0	5	9	26	4.53	541/1650	4.53	4.50	4.22	4.20	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	45	0	0	0	0	14	26	4.65	1032/1667	4.65	4.58	4.67	4.64	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	52	0	0	2	7	18	6	3.85	1181/1626	3.85	4.54	4.11	4.06	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	49	0	1	2	2	13	18	4.25	1157/1559	4.25	4.81	4.46	4.40	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	49	0	0	0	0	6	30	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.93	4.72	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	49	0	0	1	4	15	16	4.28	960/1549	4.28	4.82	4.31	4.25	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	49	0	1	1	2	13	19	4.33	919/1546	4.33	4.81	4.32	4.30	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	49	3	2	2	6	8	15	3.97	743/1323	3.97	4.57	4.00	4.08	3.97
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	66	0	2	3	4	3	7	3.53	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	66	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	66	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were special techniques successful	66	14	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 1	B 14		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General 9	Under-grad 85 Non-major 81
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 5	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 217 0101
 Title ROCK & RELATED MUSIC
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 137
 Questionnaires: 133

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1172
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	66	0	0	0	2	13	52	4.75	376/1670	4.75	4.74	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	66	0	0	0	5	17	45	4.60	503/1666	4.60	4.71	4.27	4.27	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	66	0	0	0	5	8	54	4.73	340/1406	4.73	4.82	4.32	4.39	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	66	50	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	****/1615	****	4.77	4.24	4.29	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	67	28	3	6	11	0	18	3.63	1215/1566	3.63	4.56	4.07	4.00	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	66	60	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	66	0	2	0	3	11	51	4.63	406/1650	4.63	4.50	4.22	4.20	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	66	0	0	0	1	28	38	4.55	1119/1667	4.55	4.58	4.67	4.64	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	77	1	0	0	3	25	27	4.44	515/1626	4.44	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	68	0	0	0	0	5	60	4.92	221/1559	4.92	4.81	4.46	4.40	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	68	0	0	0	1	4	60	4.91	596/1560	4.91	4.93	4.72	4.73	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	68	0	0	1	2	9	53	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.82	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	0	0	6	59	4.91	231/1546	4.91	4.81	4.32	4.30	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	69	0	0	0	0	5	59	4.92	95/1323	4.92	4.57	4.00	4.08	4.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	111	0	5	1	2	1	13	3.73	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	111	0	4	3	4	1	10	3.45	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	111	0	4	2	5	2	9	3.45	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were special techniques successful	109	18	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors		21	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	21							
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	7	General		25	Under-grad	133	Non-major	132
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	12	D	1							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives		3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		6				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 219 0101
 Title INTRO DIGITAL AUDIO WK
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1173
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.74	4.31	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	378/1666	4.70	4.71	4.27	4.27	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.39	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	610/1566	4.29	4.56	4.07	4.00	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	202/1528	4.78	4.60	4.12	4.11	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	159/1650	4.90	4.50	4.22	4.20	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1409/1667	4.20	4.58	4.67	4.64	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	435/1559	4.80	4.81	4.46	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	451/1549	4.70	4.82	4.31	4.25	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	345/1546	4.80	4.81	4.32	4.30	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	119/1323	4.90	4.57	4.00	4.08	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 226 0101
 Title THEORY IV:MUSIC WRITIN
 Instructor: BOYD, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1174
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	794/1670	4.42	4.74	4.31	4.32	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	516/1666	4.58	4.71	4.27	4.27	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	172/1406	4.92	4.82	4.32	4.39	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	346/1615	4.70	4.77	4.24	4.29	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	610/1566	4.29	4.56	4.07	4.00	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	504/1528	4.44	4.60	4.12	4.11	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	769/1650	4.36	4.50	4.22	4.20	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1206/1667	4.45	4.58	4.67	4.64	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	704/1626	4.27	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1559	****	4.81	4.46	4.40	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1560	****	4.93	4.72	4.73	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1549	****	4.82	4.31	4.25	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1546	****	4.81	4.32	4.30	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 230 0101
 Title MUSICS OF THE WORLD
 Instructor: BECK, GINA C
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1175
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	21	0	1	1	4	4	11	4.10	1167/1670	4.10	4.74	4.31	4.32	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	21	0	0	1	7	4	9	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.71	4.27	4.27	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	21	0	1	1	4	4	11	4.10	1003/1406	4.10	4.82	4.32	4.39	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	21	12	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	****/1615	****	4.77	4.24	4.29	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	21	2	2	2	3	5	7	3.68	1190/1566	3.68	4.56	4.07	4.00	3.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	21	17	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	21	0	0	2	0	4	15	4.52	541/1650	4.52	4.50	4.22	4.20	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	21	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	675/1667	4.90	4.58	4.67	4.64	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	0	1	2	2	12	2	3.63	1329/1626	3.63	4.54	4.11	4.06	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.81	4.46	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	596/1560	4.90	4.93	4.72	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	3	0	2	3	12	4.05	1125/1549	4.05	4.82	4.31	4.25	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	2	1	14	4.32	939/1546	4.32	4.81	4.32	4.30	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	1	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	200/1323	4.72	4.57	4.00	4.08	4.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.25	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.26	****
4. Were special techniques successful	35	4	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors		7	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General		4	Under-grad	42	Non-major	36
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		9				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101
 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS
 Instructor: LADD, GITA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1176
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1280/1559	4.50	4.81	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101
 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS
 Instructor: RICHARDS, E. MI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1177
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	4.50	4.81	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 303 0101
 Title MD CAMERATA--CHAMBER C
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1178
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	12	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	206/1670	4.91	4.74	4.31	4.24	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	1	0	1	20	4.82	250/1666	4.82	4.71	4.27	4.18	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	17	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1406	****	4.82	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	17	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1615	****	4.77	4.24	4.18	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	17	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1566	****	4.56	4.07	4.04	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	19	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	11	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	645/1650	4.45	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	15	7	4.32	1326/1667	4.32	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	70/1626	4.94	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	202/1549	4.91	4.82	4.31	4.25	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	31	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		10	Under-grad	34	Non-major	23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives		2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1							
				I	0	Other		8				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 304 0101
 Title UMBC JUBILEE SINGERS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1179
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	26	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	589/1670	4.57	4.74	4.31	4.24	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	26	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	595/1666	4.52	4.71	4.27	4.18	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	26	11	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	****/1406	****	4.82	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	26	10	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	****/1615	****	4.77	4.24	4.18	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	26	15	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1566	****	4.56	4.07	4.04	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	26	15	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	26	4	2	2	1	2	10	3.94	1220/1650	3.94	4.50	4.22	4.12	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	26	1	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	1216/1667	4.45	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	32	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	239/1626	4.71	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	34	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	221/1559	4.92	4.81	4.46	4.40	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	35	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.82	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	310/1546	4.83	4.81	4.32	4.24	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	36	6	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	43	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	4.03	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.45	3.68	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	4.78	4.64	3.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.86	4.54	2.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 9	Under-grad 47	Non-major 45
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 305 0101
 Title UMBC COMMUNITY SYMPHON
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1180
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	11	15	4.37	862/1670	4.37	4.74	4.31	4.24	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	452/1666	4.63	4.71	4.27	4.18	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	28	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1406	****	4.82	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	22	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/1615	****	4.77	4.24	4.18	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	26	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1566	****	4.56	4.07	4.04	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	27	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	12	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	316/1650	4.71	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	12	14	4.48	435/1626	4.48	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	21	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 1	A 27	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 31 Non-major 19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 307A 0101
 Title JAZZ IMPROV
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1181
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.77	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1566	****	4.56	4.07	4.04	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	861/1667	4.80	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
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 responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	2				
				? 0						

Course-Section: MUSC 307C 0101
 Title JAZZ WORKSHOP
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1182
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	805/1667	4.83	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.06	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.57	4.00	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	4.03	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.95	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.90	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.78	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.86	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: MUSC 307C 0101
 Title JAZZ WORKSHOP
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1182
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	6	Non-major	3
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 307D 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1183
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.06	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1	Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 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.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 307F 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1184
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.06	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307G 0101
 Title COLLEGIUM
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1185
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.04	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307I 0101
 Title JAZZ GUITAR QUARTET
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1186
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.82	4.32	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.60	4.12	4.07	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1368/1667	4.25	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.81	4.46	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.57	4.00	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.53	4.10	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.70	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.72	4.03	4.03	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					Other
					3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 307K 0101
 Title VOCAL ARTS ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID A
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1187
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.82	4.32	4.22	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1650	****	4.50	4.22	4.12	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1626	****	4.54	4.11	4.06	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1559	****	4.81	4.46	4.40	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1560	****	4.93	4.72	4.67	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1549	****	4.82	4.31	4.25	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1546	****	4.81	4.32	4.24	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	10	Non-major	7
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 responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	0				
				? 0						

Course-Section: MUSC 309 0101
 Title UMBC NEW MUSIC ENSEMBL
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1188
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	233/1666	4.83	4.71	4.27	4.18	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1615	4.83	4.77	4.24	4.18	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.04	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.07	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	167/1626	4.80	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	****	4.81	4.46	4.40	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1560	****	4.93	4.72	4.67	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	****	4.82	4.31	4.25	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1546	****	4.81	4.32	4.24	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.57	4.00	3.99	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.53	4.10	4.12	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.63	4.29	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.70	4.31	4.33	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.72	4.03	4.03	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		0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		3	Under-grad	6	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		2				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 311 0101
 Title FREE COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1189
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.77	4.24	4.18	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.04	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.07	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1312/1626	3.67	4.54	4.11	4.06	3.67	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.57	4.00	3.99	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 313 0101
 Title ADVANCED GAMELAN
 Instructor: BECK, GINA C
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1190
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	589/1670	4.57	4.74	4.31	4.24	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	355/1666	4.71	4.71	4.27	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1406	****	4.82	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1615	****	4.77	4.24	4.18	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1566	****	4.56	4.07	4.04	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.07	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	229/1650	4.80	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1626	4.60	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.57	4.00	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 319 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS IN MUSIC TE
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1191
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	234/1670	4.88	4.74	4.31	4.24	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	465/1666	4.63	4.71	4.27	4.18	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	471/1406	4.63	4.82	4.32	4.22	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	326/1615	4.71	4.77	4.24	4.18	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1285/1566	3.50	4.56	4.07	4.04	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1528	****	4.60	4.12	4.07	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	2	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	1008/1650	4.17	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	730/1667	4.88	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.06	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1559	****	4.81	4.46	4.40	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1560	****	4.93	4.72	4.67	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1549	****	4.82	4.31	4.25	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1546	****	4.81	4.32	4.24	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.99	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.53	4.10	4.12	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.63	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.70	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	4.03	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		8				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 322 0101
 Title MUSIC HISTORY II
 Instructor: BOYD, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1192
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	4	12	4.18	1071/1670	4.18	4.74	4.31	4.24	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	595/1666	4.52	4.71	4.27	4.18	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	17	4.71	363/1406	4.71	4.82	4.32	4.22	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	434/1615	4.62	4.77	4.24	4.18	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	317/1566	4.64	4.56	4.07	4.04	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	490/1528	4.45	4.60	4.12	4.07	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	541/1650	4.52	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	1256/1667	4.40	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	808/1626	4.19	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.81	4.46	4.40	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	1163/1560	4.60	4.93	4.72	4.67	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	876/1549	4.35	4.82	4.31	4.25	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	899/1546	4.35	4.81	4.32	4.24	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	1	1	5	1	6	3.71	936/1323	3.71	4.57	4.00	3.99	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	1	4	0	6	3.54	1089/1384	3.54	4.53	4.10	4.12	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	3	2	5	3.62	1153/1378	3.62	4.63	4.29	4.30	3.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	921/1378	4.15	4.70	4.31	4.33	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	356/ 904	4.29	4.72	4.03	4.03	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.04	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.95	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.90	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	4.78	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.86	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 10	****	5.00	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	5.00	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: MUSC 322 0101
 Title MUSIC HISTORY II
 Instructor: BOYD, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1192
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.71	4.27	4.18	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.82	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	245/1615	4.80	4.77	4.24	4.18	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	734/1566	4.17	4.56	4.07	4.04	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.60	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	973/1650	4.20	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1022/1559	4.40	4.81	4.46	4.40	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.93	4.72	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.82	4.31	4.25	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.24	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.53	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	348/1378	4.80	4.63	4.29	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.80	4.70	4.31	4.33	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.72	4.03	4.03	5.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	3.99	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	4.00	4.44	4.25	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	3.93	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.95	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.80	4.45	3.68	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.00	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	4.78	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.67	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 6	Non-major 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			

I	0	Other	3
?	1		

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0102
 Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1194
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1661/1666	3.67	4.71	4.27	4.18	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.33	4.77	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	4.17	4.56	4.07	4.04	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1648/1650	3.50	4.50	4.22	4.12	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.17	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	4.83	4.82	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1139/1546	4.67	4.81	4.32	4.24	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.33	4.53	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.67	4.63	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.67	4.70	4.31	4.33	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0102
 Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1195
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1661/1666	3.67	4.71	4.27	4.18	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.33	4.77	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	4.17	4.56	4.07	4.04	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1648/1650	3.50	4.50	4.22	4.12	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.17	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	4.83	4.82	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.67	4.81	4.32	4.24	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.33	4.53	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.67	4.63	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.67	4.70	4.31	4.33	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0103
 Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1196
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	4.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	3.67	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	4.33	4.77	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.17	4.56	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	421/1528	4.25	4.60	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1650	3.50	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.17	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	4.83	4.82	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.67	4.81	4.32	4.24	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.33	4.53	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.67	4.63	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.67	4.70	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.72	4.03	4.03	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.95	4.65	4.30	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.53	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.95	4.57	4.50	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.90	3.97	3.76	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0103
 Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1197
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	4.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	3.67	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	4.33	4.77	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	4.17	4.56	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	421/1528	4.25	4.60	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1650	3.50	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.17	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	4.83	4.82	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.67	4.81	4.32	4.24	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.33	4.53	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.67	4.63	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.67	4.70	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.72	4.03	4.03	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.95	4.65	4.30	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.53	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.95	4.57	4.50	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.90	3.97	3.76	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0104
 Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1198
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 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 responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0106
 Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1199
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1620/1670	4.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1666	3.67	4.71	4.27	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.33	4.77	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	4.17	4.56	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1528	4.25	4.60	4.12	4.07	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	3.50	4.50	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.17	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1549	4.83	4.82	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1139/1546	4.67	4.81	4.32	4.24	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.33	4.53	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	970/1378	4.67	4.63	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	977/1378	4.67	4.70	4.31	4.33	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0106
 Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: VILLANUEVA, JAR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1200
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1620/1670	4.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1666	3.67	4.71	4.27	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1615	4.33	4.77	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	4.17	4.56	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1528	4.25	4.60	4.12	4.07	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	3.50	4.50	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.17	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	4.83	4.82	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.67	4.81	4.32	4.24	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.57	4.00	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.33	4.53	4.10	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	970/1378	4.67	4.63	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	977/1378	4.67	4.70	4.31	4.33	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0109
 Title Music in Performance
 Instructor: Morin, Joseph
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 9
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	****	4.13	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	****	4.95	4.65	4.67	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.72	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	****	4.97	4.57	4.46	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	****	4.72	4.45	4.59	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	****	4.22	3.97	3.99	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0113
 Title Music in Performance
 Instructor: Morin, Joseph (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 10
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1537/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1508/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	874/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1406/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1274/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	953/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	896/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1146/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1139/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1323	****	4.13	4.00	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	820/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	603/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	718/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors		3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0113
 Title Music in Performance
 Instructor: Villanueva, Jari(Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 11
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1537/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1508/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	874/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1406/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1274/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	896/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	715/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	820/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	603/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	718/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 385 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE CONDUCTIN
 Instructor: MCCOY, MARK
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1201
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1666	4.86	4.71	4.27	4.18	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	226/1406	4.86	4.82	4.32	4.22	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1615	4.83	4.77	4.24	4.18	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566	4.80	4.56	4.07	4.04	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1202/1528	3.67	4.60	4.12	4.07	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1347/1667	4.29	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	563/1626	4.40	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.81	4.32	4.24	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	4.57	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.53	4.10	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.63	4.29	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1378	****	4.70	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.72	4.03	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 8	Non-major 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 390B 0201
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1202
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.06	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	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	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 responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	1			
				? 0					

Course-Section: MUSC 390F 0101
 Title ELECTRIC GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1203
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1204
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.50	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.54	4.11	4.06	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	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	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 390K 0101
 Title CLARINET
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1205
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies							Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.04	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.06	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	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	2	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 responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	2				
				? 0						

Course-Section: MUSC 390S 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1206
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.06	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 390W 0201
 Title UPRIGHT BASS
 Instructor: RUAS, LAURA
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1207
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 401 0101
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS: COMP
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1208
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.56	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.60	4.12	4.26	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.28	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	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	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 401 0101
 Title Special Projects: Comp
 Instructor: Smith, Stuart
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 5
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 417 0101
 Title SPEC TPCS IN MUSC TECH
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1209
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.74	4.31	4.45	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.71	4.27	4.35	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.56	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.60	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1524/1667	4.00	4.58	4.67	4.73	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.54	4.11	4.28	4.33

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.82	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.81	4.32	4.43	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.57	4.00	4.10	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		

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

Course-Section: MUSC 418 0101
 Title MUSIC TECH. INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1210
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.74	4.31	4.45	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.37	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.56	4.07	4.17	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.60	4.12	4.26	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.58	4.67	4.73	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.28	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 418 0101
 Title Music Tech. Intern.
 Instructor: Wonneberger, Alan
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected 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	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	2				
				? 0						

Course-Section: MUSC 428 0101
 Title ELECTRONIC MUSIC
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1211
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.56	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.60	4.12	4.26	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1624/1650	2.50	4.50	4.22	4.28	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.58	4.67	4.73	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.54	4.11	4.28	4.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.53	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.70	4.31	4.60	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 480 0101
 Title TOPICS IN MUSC/ART/SOC
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1212
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.74	4.31	4.45	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.71	4.27	4.35	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.56	4.07	4.17	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.60	4.12	4.26	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	4.75	4.50	4.22	4.28	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.57	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.53	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	481/1378	4.67	4.63	4.29	4.55	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.70	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.72	4.03	4.22	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
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	0
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 492 0101
 Title Senior Project
 Instructor: Kim-Boyle, David
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 2
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1139/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1323	****	4.13	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected 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	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 691 8010
 Title AMERICAN MUSIC
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1213
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1670	4.83	4.74	4.31	4.46	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.71	4.27	4.34	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1615	4.83	4.77	4.24	4.33	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1566	4.83	4.56	4.07	4.20	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	631/1528	4.33	4.60	4.12	4.33	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.50	4.22	4.30	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.57	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.53	4.10	4.21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.63	4.29	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.70	4.31	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	146/ 904	4.75	4.72	4.03	4.04	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	5.00	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	4.00	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	5.00	4.31	4.58	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	53/ 87	4.80	4.95	4.65	4.61	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.67	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	37/ 75	4.80	4.95	4.57	4.66	4.80
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	41/ 79	4.60	4.80	4.45	4.58	4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	25/ 80	4.60	4.90	3.97	4.32	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 694 8010
 Title SOLO PERF STUDY
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1214
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.74	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.71	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.82	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.77	4.24	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.50	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.58	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.54	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.81	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.93	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.82	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.81	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.57	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.53	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.63	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.70	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.72	4.03	4.04	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.95	4.65	4.61	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.67	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.95	4.57	4.66	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.80	4.45	4.58	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.90	3.97	4.32	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 694 8010
 Title Solo Performance Study
 Instructor: Cella, Lisa
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 6
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 694 8010
 Title Solo Performance Study
 Instructor: Franklin, Rachel
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 7
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	****	4.13	4.00	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 87	****	4.95	4.65	4.67	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.72	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 75	****	4.97	4.57	4.46	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	****	4.72	4.45	4.59	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	****	4.22	3.97	3.99	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 694 8010
 Title Solo Performance Study
 Instructor: Tanosaki, Kasuko
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 8
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1216/1670	****	4.51	4.31	4.23	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1666	****	4.52	4.27	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1057/1406	****	4.52	4.32	4.31	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1615	****	4.45	4.24	4.17	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	****	4.39	4.07	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1528	****	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1580/1650	****	4.51	4.22	4.28	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	****	4.86	4.67	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1534/1626	****	4.34	4.11	4.07	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1518/1559	****	4.65	4.46	4.47	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1467/1560	****	4.87	4.72	4.68	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1549	****	4.48	4.31	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1139/1546	****	4.51	4.32	4.32	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1323	****	4.13	4.00	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	****	4.63	4.10	3.92	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	970/1378	****	4.75	4.29	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	977/1378	****	4.89	4.31	4.08	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	461/ 904	****	4.22	4.03	3.94	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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