

Course-Section: DANC 110 0101
 Title BEGIN MOD DANC TECH I
 Instructor: WALTON, ELIZABE
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 419
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	7	13	4.43	654/1504	4.43	4.58	4.27	4.13	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	14	4.39	663/1503	4.39	4.31	4.20	4.16	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	17	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1290	****	4.85	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	775/1453	4.25	3.95	4.21	4.11	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	19	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1421	****	3.87	4.00	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	2	5	2	7	3.71	1040/1365	3.71	3.47	4.08	3.96	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	1	1	5	4	8	3.89	1092/1485	3.89	3.59	4.16	4.13	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	5	4.22	1300/1504	4.22	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.28	4.06	3.97	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.51	4.41	4.36	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	303/1418	4.73	4.45	4.25	4.20	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	255/1416	4.80	4.60	4.26	4.21	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	3	0	0	3	0	6	4.33	429/1199	4.33	3.87	3.97	3.82	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.52	4.00	3.69	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.78	4.24	3.93	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	798/1299	4.25	4.73	4.25	3.94	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.95	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	22	Non-major	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	4						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: DANC 116 0101
 Title BALLET I (ELEMENTARY)
 Instructor: LACY, SANDRA L
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 420
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	17	4.89	146/1504	4.89	4.58	4.27	4.13	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	64/1503	4.94	4.31	4.20	4.16	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1290	****	4.85	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	222/1453	4.71	3.95	4.21	4.11	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1421	****	3.87	4.00	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	0	3	1	7	3.64	1078/1365	3.64	3.47	4.08	3.96	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	761/1485	4.25	3.59	4.16	4.13	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	1058/1504	4.56	4.54	4.69	4.66	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	258/1483	4.60	4.28	4.06	3.97	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	300/1425	4.82	4.51	4.41	4.36	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	99/1416	4.94	4.60	4.26	4.21	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1199	****	3.87	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1312	****	4.52	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1303	****	4.78	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1299	****	4.73	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.95	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: DANC 202 0101
 Title DANCE HIST II: CONTEMP
 Instructor: WALTON, ELIZABE
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 421
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	284/1504	4.73	4.58	4.27	4.26	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	649/1503	4.40	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	642/1290	4.40	4.85	4.28	4.27	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	3.95	4.21	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	705/1421	4.07	3.87	4.00	3.90	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	967/1365	3.80	3.47	4.08	4.00	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	990/1485	4.00	3.59	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	6	3	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.28	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.51	4.41	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	539/1418	4.54	4.45	4.25	4.22	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	593/1416	4.53	4.60	4.26	4.24	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	88/1199	4.87	3.87	3.97	3.95	4.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	612/1312	4.22	4.52	4.00	3.98	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	630/1303	4.44	4.78	4.24	4.23	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	333/1299	4.78	4.73	4.25	4.21	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.95	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.24	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2

84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0
				P	0		
				I	0	Other	11
				?	2		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: DANC 216 0101
 Title BALLET II (INTERMEDIAT
 Instructor: AGEL, CHARLES
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 422
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	3	11	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.58	4.27	4.26	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	1014/1503	4.07	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.85	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.00	3.95	4.21	4.20	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	2	5	1	4	3.58	1253/1485	3.58	3.59	4.16	4.15	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	679/1483	4.21	4.28	4.06	4.02	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1425	****	4.51	4.41	4.40	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1418	****	4.45	4.25	4.22	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1416	****	4.60	4.26	4.24	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	3.87	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	592/1312	4.25	4.52	4.00	3.98	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.78	4.24	4.23	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1299	****	4.73	4.25	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: DANC 230 0101
 Title IMPROVISATION
 Instructor: LACY, SANDRA L
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 423
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	10	4.83	183/1504	4.83	4.58	4.27	4.26	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	633/1503	4.42	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.85	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1453	****	3.95	4.21	4.20	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	3.87	4.00	3.90	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	3.47	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	926/1485	4.11	3.59	4.16	4.15	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	778/1504	4.83	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	149/1483	4.75	4.28	4.06	4.02	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	525/1425	4.70	4.51	4.41	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.22	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	142/1416	4.90	4.60	4.26	4.24	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1199	****	3.87	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.52	4.00	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.78	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.73	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.95	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	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	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	3	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	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: DANC 301J 0101
 Title INTER/ADV JAZZ WORKSHO
 Instructor: KATRINIC, KAREN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 424
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	1	1	9	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.31	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.85	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	3.95	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1421	****	3.87	4.00	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1153/1365	3.50	3.47	4.08	4.08	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	990/1485	4.00	3.59	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1041/1504	4.58	4.54	4.69	4.65	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	306/1483	4.55	4.28	4.06	4.08	4.55

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1036/1425	4.25	4.51	4.41	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.87	4.69	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.60	4.26	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.87	3.97	4.02	3.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1312	****	4.52	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	4.78	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	****	4.73	4.25	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: DANC 301S 0101
 Title SPCL STUDIES IN DANCE
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 425
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	1	4	4	3.73	1280/1504	3.73	4.58	4.27	4.27	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	0	3	1	2	2.55	1482/1503	2.55	4.31	4.20	4.22	2.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	1	1	4	1	2.73	1439/1453	2.73	3.95	4.21	4.23	2.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	3	2	2.91	1337/1421	2.91	3.87	4.00	4.01	2.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	2	2	1	2.45	1350/1365	2.45	3.47	4.08	4.08	2.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	3	3	0	1	2	2.56	1449/1485	2.56	3.59	4.16	4.17	2.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1130/1504	4.45	4.54	4.69	4.65	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	5	1	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	4.28	4.06	4.08	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	5	1	1	2.89	1388/1425	2.89	4.51	4.41	4.43	2.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	790/1426	4.78	4.87	4.69	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	2	2	1	2.67	1379/1418	2.67	4.45	4.25	4.26	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	4	1	1	2.67	1362/1416	2.67	4.60	4.26	4.27	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	860/1199	3.67	3.87	3.97	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	676/1312	4.13	4.52	4.00	4.09	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.78	4.24	4.27	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	484/1299	4.63	4.73	4.25	4.30	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	243/ 758	4.40	3.95	4.01	4.00	4.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	5.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	5.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	5.00	4.29	4.14	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	11	Non-major	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P	0			
				I	0	Other	2	
				?	0			

Course-Section: DANC 310 0101
 Title INTERM MODERN DANCE I
 Instructor: HAMBY, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 426
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	3	5	4.44	639/1504	4.44	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	1331/1503	3.44	4.31	4.20	4.22	3.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1339/1453	3.38	3.95	4.21	4.23	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	2	2	1	3.13	1280/1365	3.13	3.47	4.08	4.08	3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	3	2	1	2.78	1424/1485	2.78	3.59	4.16	4.17	2.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1138/1504	4.44	4.54	4.69	4.65	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	2	4	1	3.33	1302/1483	3.33	4.28	4.06	4.08	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1291/1425	3.60	4.51	4.41	4.43	3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1290/1426	4.20	4.87	4.69	4.71	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1282/1418	3.40	4.45	4.25	4.26	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	871/1416	4.25	4.60	4.26	4.27	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	3.87	3.97	4.02	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1312	****	4.52	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1303	****	4.78	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1299	****	4.73	4.25	4.30	****

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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	2	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	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: DANC 316 0101
 Title BALLET III
 Instructor: DOLID, LAURA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 427
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	3	10	4.64	376/1504	4.64	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	279/1503	4.69	4.31	4.20	4.22	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.85	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	963/1453	4.08	3.95	4.21	4.23	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	3.87	4.00	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	935/1365	3.86	3.47	4.08	4.08	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	1122/1485	3.85	3.59	4.16	4.17	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	525/1504	4.93	4.54	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	518/1483	4.36	4.28	4.06	4.08	4.36

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
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	2						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: DANC 320 0101
 Title INTERM MODERN DANCE II
 Instructor: HAMBY, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 428
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	2	9	4.43	669/1504	4.43	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1008/1503	4.08	4.31	4.20	4.22	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1290	****	4.85	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	1282/1453	3.50	3.95	4.21	4.23	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	2	4	3	3.42	1196/1365	3.42	3.47	4.08	4.08	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	6	0	3.00	1387/1485	3.00	3.59	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1353/1504	4.14	4.54	4.69	4.65	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1141/1483	3.73	4.28	4.06	4.08	3.73

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1425	****	4.51	4.41	4.43	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1426	****	4.87	4.69	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1418	****	4.45	4.25	4.26	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1416	****	4.60	4.26	4.27	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1199	****	3.87	3.97	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	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	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: DANC 326 0101
 Title MTHDS OF TEACHING DANC
 Instructor: HESS, CAROL A
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 429
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	10	4.77	250/1504	4.77	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.31	4.20	4.22	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.85	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	320/1453	4.62	3.95	4.21	4.23	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	112/1421	4.85	3.87	4.00	4.01	4.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	441/1365	4.38	3.47	4.08	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	8	4	4.23	784/1485	4.23	3.59	4.16	4.17	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1069/1504	4.54	4.54	4.69	4.65	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	258/1483	4.60	4.28	4.06	4.08	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	285/1425	4.83	4.51	4.41	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.60	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1199	****	3.87	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1312	****	4.52	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	****	4.78	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1299	****	4.73	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.95	4.01	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	****	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	****	4.35	4.24	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.65	4.77	****

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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: DANC 330 0101
 Title DANCE COMPOSITION I
 Instructor: HAMBY, DOUGLAS
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 430
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	3	5	4.44	639/1504	4.44	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	981/1503	4.11	4.31	4.20	4.22	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.85	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	775/1453	4.25	3.95	4.21	4.23	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	1474/1485	2.20	3.59	4.16	4.17	2.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1138/1504	4.44	4.54	4.69	4.65	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.28	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.51	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.60	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	3.87	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1312	****	4.52	4.00	4.09	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1303	****	4.78	4.24	4.27	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1299	****	4.73	4.25	4.30	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 758	****	3.95	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	9

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: DANC 340 0101
 Title DANCE AND TECHNOLOGY
 Instructor: HESS, CAROL A
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 431
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	3	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.58	4.27	4.27	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.31	4.20	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.85	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1453	4.67	3.95	4.21	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1017/1421	3.67	3.87	4.00	4.01	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1176/1485	3.75	3.59	4.16	4.17	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.54	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1483	4.75	4.28	4.06	4.08	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.51	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.60	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	429/1199	4.33	3.87	3.97	4.02	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.52	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.78	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.73	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	580/ 758	3.50	3.95	4.01	4.00	3.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.13	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.77	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.14	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.47	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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 4	Non-major 0
84-150	3	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 4		
				? 0			

Course-Section: DANC 416 0101
 Title ADVANCED BALLET
 Instructor: AGEL, CHARLES
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 432
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	8	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.58	4.27	4.33	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	171/1503	4.80	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	3.95	4.21	4.22	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	3	4	0	3.57	1257/1485	3.57	3.59	4.16	4.14	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1173/1504	4.40	4.54	4.69	4.73	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	84/1483	4.90	4.28	4.06	4.11	4.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1425	****	4.51	4.41	4.38	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1426	****	4.87	4.69	4.72	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1418	****	4.45	4.25	4.25	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1416	****	4.60	4.26	4.26	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1199	****	3.87	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1312	****	4.52	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	4.78	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	****	4.73	4.25	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: DANC 420 0101
 Title ADV DANCE TECHNIQUE II
 Instructor: LACY, SANDRA L
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 433
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	2	9	4.67	357/1504	4.67	4.58	4.27	4.33	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	707/1503	4.36	4.31	4.20	4.18	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.85	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	901/1453	4.14	3.95	4.21	4.22	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	3.87	4.00	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	1	2	0	2	2.86	1321/1365	2.86	3.47	4.08	4.09	2.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	943/1485	4.09	3.59	4.16	4.14	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.54	4.69	4.73	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	258/1483	4.60	4.28	4.06	4.11	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.51	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.87	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.60	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1199	****	3.87	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1312	****	4.52	4.00	4.07	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	4.78	4.24	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	****	4.73	4.25	4.38	****
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.95	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	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	12	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	0	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	10				
				?	1						