

Course-Section: MUSC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO MUSIC
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 196
 Questionnaires: 77

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1039
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	0	0	4	7	17	47	4.43	707/1522	4.43	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	7	17	48	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	4	20	48	4.48	554/1285	4.48	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	49	2	1	1	6	15	4.24	815/1476	4.24	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	16	9	6	17	8	19	3.37	1239/1412	3.37	4.38	4.06	4.01	3.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	61	2	1	0	3	7	3.92	****/1381	****	4.48	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	8	14	51	4.51	483/1500	4.51	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.51	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	64	9	4.12	1343/1517	4.12	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	1	6	32	18	4.18	744/1497	4.18	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	6	66	4.89	208/1440	4.89	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	6	65	4.89	548/1448	4.89	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	8	63	4.82	198/1436	4.82	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	1	2	7	62	4.81	294/1432	4.81	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	4	8	57	4.68	168/1221	4.68	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	54	0	5	2	4	5	7	3.30	1117/1280	3.30	4.24	4.10	3.92	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	54	0	9	2	4	6	2	2.57	1266/1277	2.57	4.54	4.34	4.13	2.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	54	0	5	1	5	5	7	3.35	1154/1269	3.35	4.27	4.31	4.04	3.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	51	22	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	76	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	74	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	75	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.00	4.52	4.03	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	75	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	76	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	76	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	76	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	76	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	74	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	74	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	4.55	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	74	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	74	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.67	4.49	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 38	Required for Majors	43
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 5	C 4	General	14
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 1	Electives	3
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	1			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	2			

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0101
 Title: FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1040
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	4	5	14	4.15	1001/1522	4.17	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	18	4.54	511/1522	4.49	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	18	4.58	456/1285	4.60	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1293/1476	3.81	4.70	4.22	4.09	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	327/1412	4.28	4.38	4.06	4.01	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	2	2	7	3	7	3.52	1147/1381	3.90	4.48	4.08	3.93	3.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	3	16	4.31	731/1500	4.50	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	532/1517	4.84	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	7	14	3	3.72	1167/1497	3.89	4.50	4.11	4.02	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	774/1440	4.48	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	954/1448	4.72	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	15	4.52	576/1436	4.44	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	1	3	17	4.52	611/1432	4.46	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	695/1221	3.86	4.44	3.93	3.86	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	1	3	1	2	3.00	1187/1280	3.50	4.24	4.10	3.92	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	3	1	1	1	3	3.00	1214/1277	3.39	4.54	4.34	4.13	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	3	0	2	0	4	3.22	1182/1269	3.75	4.27	4.31	4.04	3.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	3.00	4.58	4.13	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 16
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C 2	General 4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0	Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 24
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 1
					Other 3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0201
 Title: FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
 Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 81
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1041
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	0	1	3	5	14	22	4.18	980/1522	4.17	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	3	12	28	4.44	639/1522	4.49	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	4	9	31	4.61	415/1285	4.60	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.61		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	27	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	982/1476	3.81	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	7	6	1	2	6	23	4.03	747/1412	4.28	4.38	4.06	4.01	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	29	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	594/1381	3.90	4.48	4.08	3.93	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	1	2	6	34	4.70	275/1500	4.50	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	1	0	6	37	4.80	731/1517	4.84	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	7	17	9	4.06	859/1497	3.89	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	16	23	4.44	877/1440	4.48	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	7	33	4.74	897/1448	4.72	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	1	3	13	23	4.37	762/1436	4.44	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	7	9	26	4.40	766/1432	4.46	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	14	3	2	6	3	14	3.82	746/1221	3.86	4.44	3.93	3.86	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	2	0	3	4	9	4.00	718/1280	3.50	4.24	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	2	1	3	5	7	3.78	1059/1277	3.39	4.54	4.34	4.13	3.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	763/1269	3.75	4.27	4.31	4.04	4.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	8	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	3.00	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	3.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.00	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.55	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.67	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0201
 Title FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
 Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 81
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1041
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	32	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	8	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	48	Non-major	48
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 111 0101
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB II
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1042
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 13

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	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	433/1522	4.73	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	358/1522	4.83	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	150/1285	4.95	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	285/1476	4.81	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1412	4.86	4.38	4.06	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	289/1381	4.78	4.48	4.08	3.93	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	700/1500	4.57	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1319/1517	4.25	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	264/1497	4.75	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1440	4.78	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	478/1436	4.80	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	884/1432	4.63	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1221	4.60	4.44	3.93	3.86	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	324/1280	4.60	4.24	4.10	3.92	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1269	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.04	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 13 Non-major 3
84-150	1	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	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 111 0201
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB II
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1043
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	12	4.79	275/1522	4.73	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1522	4.83	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1285	4.95	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	112/1476	4.81	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1412	4.86	4.38	4.06	4.01	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1381	4.78	4.48	4.08	3.93	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	160/1500	4.57	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1217/1517	4.25	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	134/1497	4.75	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	740/1440	4.78	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1436	4.80	4.68	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1432	4.63	4.69	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	213/1221	4.60	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1280	4.60	4.24	4.10	3.92	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1002/1269	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.04	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****	

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 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0301
 Title: MUSIC REPERTOIRE
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1044
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	5.00	1/1522	4.80	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	4.90	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	4.95	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.20	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	4.86	4.50	4.11	4.02	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	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 112 0601
 Title: MUSIC REPERTOIRE
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1045
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	7	4.60	492/1522	4.80	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	228/1285	4.90	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	125/1476	4.95	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.48	4.08	3.93	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1161/1517	4.20	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	223/1497	4.86	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	859/1448	4.75	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	99/1221	4.80	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	477/1280	4.40	4.24	4.10	3.92	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.37	4.02	3.87	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 126 0101
 Title THEORY II:FORM&ANALYSI
 Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1046
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	14	4.93	123/1522	4.08	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	277/1522	3.98	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	366/1285	4.28	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	535/1476	4.04	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	493/1412	4.08	4.38	4.06	4.01	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	458/1381	3.97	4.48	4.08	3.93	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	988/1500	3.32	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	952/1517	4.63	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	223/1497	3.86	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	336/1440	4.34	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.85	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	762/1436	3.79	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	632/1432	4.04	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	606/1221	4.12	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	311/1280	4.10	4.24	4.10	3.92	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	508/1277	4.60	4.54	4.34	4.13	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	381/1269	4.45	4.27	4.31	4.04	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	652/ 854	3.40	4.37	4.02	3.87	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5	Graduate	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course-Section: MUSC 126 0201
 Title THEORY II:FORM&ANALYSI
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1047
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	3	2	5	4	4	3.22	1468/1522	4.08	4.73	4.30	4.14	3.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	7	1	5	3.22	1451/1522	3.98	4.72	4.26	4.18	3.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	3	9	3.89	1034/1285	4.28	4.78	4.30	4.22	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	6	5	3.61	1275/1476	4.04	4.70	4.22	4.09	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	948/1412	4.08	4.38	4.06	4.01	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	4	2	3	6	3.56	1138/1381	3.97	4.48	4.08	3.93	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	3	5	1	3	2.65	1465/1500	3.32	4.39	4.18	4.16	2.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	983/1517	4.63	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	3	6	1	3	3.00	1418/1497	3.86	4.50	4.11	4.02	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1269/1440	4.34	4.68	4.45	4.40	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	802/1448	4.85	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	3	4	0	5	3.21	1356/1436	3.79	4.68	4.29	4.24	3.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	3	4	4	3.57	1251/1432	4.04	4.69	4.29	4.23	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	474/1221	4.12	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	1000/1280	4.10	4.24	4.10	3.92	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	547/1277	4.60	4.54	4.34	4.13	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	836/1269	4.45	4.27	4.31	4.04	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	747/ 854	3.40	4.37	4.02	3.87	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	3.00	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	3.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.00	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.55	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.67	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 126 0201
 Title THEORY II:FORM&ANALYSI
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1047
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 170 0101
 Title BEGINNING VOICE CLASS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1048
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	9	4.64	453/1522	4.64	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	299/1522	4.71	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	318/1285	4.71	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	100/1476	4.93	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	3	6	3.77	1005/1412	3.77	4.38	4.06	4.01	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1008/1381	3.82	4.48	4.08	3.93	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	950/1500	4.07	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	623/1517	4.85	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	763/1440	4.54	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	395/1448	4.92	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	564/1436	4.54	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	418/1432	4.69	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	480/1221	4.22	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	499/1280	4.38	4.24	4.10	3.92	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	121/ 854	4.71	4.37	4.02	3.87	4.71	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 33	****	4.55	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.67	4.49	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 171 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE VOICE CLA
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1049
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1257/1412	3.33	4.38	4.06	4.01	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	519/1381	4.33	4.48	4.08	3.93	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	573/1497	4.33	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.24	4.10	3.92	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.04	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.64	4.63	4.53	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.57	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 22	5.00	4.00	4.54	4.31	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 18	5.00	3.67	4.49	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	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	1	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 4	Non-major 4
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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 172B 0101
 Title
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1050
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.48	4.08	3.93	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1430/1500	3.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.24	4.10	3.92	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1207/1269	3.00	4.27	4.31	4.04	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 175 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE VOCAL MET
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1051
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	2	3	2	3.75	1295/1522	3.75	4.73	4.30	4.14	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	874/1522	4.25	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	650/1285	4.40	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	913/1476	4.14	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	566/1412	4.25	4.38	4.06	4.01	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.48	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1251/1517	4.29	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1204/1497	3.67	4.50	4.11	4.02	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	4.44	3.93	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.24	4.10	3.92	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Major 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	3

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 178B 0101
 Title BEGINNING KEYBOARD SKI
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1052
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	3	10	4.44	694/1522	4.64	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	334/1522	4.76	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	150/1285	4.83	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	162/1476	4.92	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	411/1412	4.59	4.38	4.06	4.01	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	207/1381	4.83	4.48	4.08	3.93	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	211/1500	4.65	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	1185/1517	4.34	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	674/1497	4.17	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1440	4.25	4.68	4.45	4.40	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1448	4.40	4.89	4.71	4.63	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1436	4.50	4.68	4.29	4.24	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1432	3.75	4.69	4.29	4.23	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	3.67	4.44	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	3.00	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	3.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.00	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	4.53	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	4.55	4.69	4.57	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.67	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 178B 0101
 Title BEGINNING KEYBOARD SKI
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1052
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 178B 0201
 Title BEGINNING KEYBOARD SKI
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1053
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	225/1522	4.64	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	179/1522	4.76	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	278/1285	4.83	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1476	4.92	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1412	4.59	4.38	4.06	4.01	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1381	4.83	4.48	4.08	3.93	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	444/1500	4.65	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1241/1517	4.34	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	833/1497	4.17	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1047/1440	4.25	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1241/1448	4.40	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1191/1432	3.75	4.69	4.29	4.23	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	832/1221	3.67	4.44	3.93	3.86	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	3.00	4.42	4.41	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	4.55	4.69	4.57	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	2	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	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0101
 Title INTERM KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1054
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	2	5	4.38	767/1522	4.47	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1522	4.94	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1476	4.67	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1412	4.60	4.38	4.06	4.01	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	247/1381	4.55	4.48	4.08	3.93	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	415/1500	4.64	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1019/1517	4.43	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1239/1497	3.87	4.50	4.11	4.02	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1440	4.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1436	3.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1432	3.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1221	****	4.44	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0201
 Title INTERM KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1055
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	5	4.57	525/1522	4.47	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1522	4.94	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	473/1476	4.67	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1412	4.60	4.38	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	331/1381	4.55	4.48	4.08	3.93	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	252/1500	4.64	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1251/1517	4.43	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	782/1497	3.87	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1378/1436	3.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1364/1432	3.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****	

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 2		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	7
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0101
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1056
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	4	11	4.37	779/1522	4.39	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	465/1522	4.68	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	347/1285	4.74	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	336/1476	4.65	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	585/1412	4.08	4.38	4.06	4.01	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	1070/1381	3.71	4.48	4.08	3.93	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	4	2	8	3.72	1204/1500	3.97	4.39	4.18	4.16	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	4.37	1193/1517	4.39	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	794/1497	4.03	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	320/1440	4.79	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1448	4.97	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	151/1436	4.84	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	267/1432	4.63	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	532/1221	4.38	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	644/1280	3.92	4.24	4.10	3.92	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	867/1277	4.25	4.54	4.34	4.13	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1194/1269	2.75	4.27	4.31	4.04	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 15	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0201
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1057
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	7	10	4.42	707/1522	4.39	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	222/1522	4.68	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	248/1285	4.74	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	336/1476	4.65	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	4	1	7	3.93	865/1412	4.08	4.38	4.06	4.01	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/1381	3.71	4.48	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	1	12	4.21	819/1500	3.97	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	4.42	1144/1517	4.39	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	10	3	3.93	993/1497	4.03	4.50	4.11	4.02	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	452/1440	4.79	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	346/1448	4.97	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	207/1436	4.84	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	720/1432	4.63	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	206/1221	4.38	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	959/1280	3.92	4.24	4.10	3.92	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	743/1277	4.25	4.54	4.34	4.13	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	2	1	0	1	2.33	1258/1269	2.75	4.27	4.31	4.04	2.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	4.53	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	4.00	4.54	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 181 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE PIANO CLA
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1058
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	6	4.56	548/1522	4.56	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	488/1522	4.56	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	706/1285	4.33	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	207/1476	4.78	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1013/1412	3.75	4.38	4.06	4.01	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	0	3	3.63	1119/1381	3.63	4.48	4.08	3.93	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1168/1500	3.78	4.39	4.18	4.16	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1185/1517	4.38	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1023/1440	4.29	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	859/1448	4.75	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	357/1436	4.71	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	732/1432	4.43	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	500/1221	4.20	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****	

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 0		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Course-Section: MUSC 183 0101
 Title INTERM STRING CLASS
 Instructor: LADD, GITA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1059
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	4.83	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.71	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1476	4.83	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	231/1412	4.83	4.38	4.06	4.01	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.48	4.08	3.93	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1500	4.67	4.39	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1080/1517	4.25	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	573/1497	4.17	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	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	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 183 0201
 Title INTERM STRING CLASS
 Instructor: LADD, GITA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1060
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	433/1522	4.83	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	358/1522	4.71	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	316/1476	4.83	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1412	4.83	4.38	4.06	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.48	4.08	3.93	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	700/1500	4.67	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.25	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	898/1497	4.17	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1436	4.67	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.24	4.10	3.92	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.37	4.02	3.87	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	1	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	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 189 0101
 Title GUITAR CLASS
 Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1061
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1476	4.75	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1412	****	4.38	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1381	****	4.48	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	211/1500	4.75	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.61	4.65	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1187/1280	3.00	4.24	4.10	3.92	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****	

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 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1062
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	6	4.86	211/1522	4.86	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	299/1522	4.71	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1381	****	4.48	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1497	4.60	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.60	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.64	4.63	4.53	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.57	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	4.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.67	4.49	4.11	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1063
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	6	4.86	211/1522	4.86	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	299/1522	4.71	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1381	****	4.48	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	312/1497	4.60	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1440	****	4.68	4.45	4.40	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1448	****	4.89	4.71	4.63	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1432	****	4.69	4.29	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.64	4.63	4.53	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.57	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	4.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.67	4.49	4.11	****	

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	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 7	Non-major 7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1064
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.75	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1353/1448	4.50	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1056/1436	4.50	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1036/1432	4.50	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	4.44	3.93	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.24	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1214/1277	3.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1207/1269	3.00	4.27	4.31	4.04	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	220/ 228	3.00	3.00	4.35	4.33	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	211/ 217	3.00	3.00	4.51	4.51	3.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	203/ 216	3.00	3.00	4.42	4.41	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	194/ 205	3.00	3.00	4.23	4.28	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	75/ 79	3.00	3.00	4.58	4.13	3.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	75/ 77	2.00	2.00	4.52	4.03	2.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	61/ 65	3.00	3.00	4.49	3.85	3.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	74/ 78	3.00	3.00	4.45	3.88	3.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	70/ 80	3.00	3.00	4.11	3.79	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	44/ 47	3.00	3.00	4.41	3.90	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	40/ 45	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.90	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	35/ 39	3.00	3.00	4.40	3.99	3.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	32/ 35	3.00	3.00	4.31	4.00	3.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	32/ 34	3.00	3.00	4.30	4.11	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	36/ 37	3.00	4.64	4.63	4.53	3.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	21/ 23	3.00	4.00	4.41	4.19	3.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	32/ 33	3.00	4.55	4.69	4.57	3.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	21/ 22	3.00	4.00	4.54	4.31	3.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	17/ 18	3.00	3.67	4.49	4.11	3.00	

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1064
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1065
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.75	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	4.50	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	4.50	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	4.50	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.24	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1214/1277	3.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1207/1269	3.00	4.27	4.31	4.04	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	220/ 228	3.00	3.00	4.35	4.33	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	211/ 217	3.00	3.00	4.51	4.51	3.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	203/ 216	3.00	3.00	4.42	4.41	3.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	194/ 205	3.00	3.00	4.23	4.28	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	75/ 79	3.00	3.00	4.58	4.13	3.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	75/ 77	2.00	2.00	4.52	4.03	2.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	61/ 65	3.00	3.00	4.49	3.85	3.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	74/ 78	3.00	3.00	4.45	3.88	3.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	70/ 80	3.00	3.00	4.11	3.79	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	44/ 47	3.00	3.00	4.41	3.90	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	40/ 45	3.00	3.00	4.30	3.90	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	35/ 39	3.00	3.00	4.40	3.99	3.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	32/ 35	3.00	3.00	4.31	4.00	3.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	32/ 34	3.00	3.00	4.30	4.11	3.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	36/ 37	3.00	4.64	4.63	4.53	3.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	21/ 23	3.00	4.00	4.41	4.19	3.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	32/ 33	3.00	4.55	4.69	4.57	3.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	21/ 22	3.00	4.00	4.54	4.31	3.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	17/ 18	3.00	3.67	4.49	4.11	3.00	

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1065
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190C 0101
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1066
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1412	****	4.38	4.06	4.01	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	700/1500	4.33	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	279/1221	4.50	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.64	4.63	4.53	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.57	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.00	4.54	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	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	4	Under-grad	6	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190D 0101
 Title VIOLA
 Instructor: BUSCHEK, KIMBER
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1067
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.64	4.63	4.53	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 23	5.00	4.00	4.41	4.19	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 33	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.57	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 22	5.00	4.00	4.54	4.31	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	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 190E 0101
 Title CELLO
 Instructor: COX, FRANKLIN
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1068
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	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 190I 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1069
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.01	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	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	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190I 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: KESNER, LORI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1070
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.01	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	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	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1071
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	932/1517	4.67	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	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	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 3
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 190Q 0101
 Title SAXOPHONE
 Instructor: BEIZER, MATTHE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1072
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	3.86	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	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 190S 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THO (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1073
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.38	4.06	4.01	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1486/1497	3.50	4.50	4.11	4.02	3.50

Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.64	4.63	4.53	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.57	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	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 1				
				? 0					

Course-Section: MUSC 190S 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: DAVE, BARRY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1074
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.38	4.06	4.01	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	3.50	4.50	4.11	4.02	3.50	

Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.64	4.63	4.53	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.57	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	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 1				
				? 0					

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0101
 Title RECITAL PREPARATION
 Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1075
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	1	0	4	6	11	4.18	970/1522	4.06	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	5	11	4.09	1032/1522	4.08	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	16	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1285	4.50	4.78	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	827/1476	4.36	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	20	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1412	3.80	4.38	4.06	4.01	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1381	4.20	4.48	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	149/1500	4.32	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	487/1517	4.91	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	3	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1133/1497	4.25	4.50	4.11	4.02	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	336/1440	4.82	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448	4.91	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	123/1436	4.90	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	707/1432	4.44	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	2	0	0	1	5	3.88	714/1221	3.88	4.44	3.93	3.86	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	416/1280	4.47	4.24	4.10	3.92	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	299/1277	4.82	4.54	4.34	4.13	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	310/1269	4.82	4.27	4.31	4.04	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	153/ 854	4.64	4.37	4.02	3.87	4.64	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0						
				?	0						
						Other					17

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0301
 Title RECITAL PREPARATION
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1076
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	3	3	6	3.93	1200/1522	4.06	4.73	4.30	4.14	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	1	8	4.07	1042/1522	4.08	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	473/1476	4.36	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	973/1412	3.80	4.38	4.06	4.01	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	663/1381	4.20	4.48	4.08	3.93	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	0	4	1	5	3.82	1141/1500	4.32	4.39	4.18	4.16	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	438/1517	4.91	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	223/1497	4.25	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.71

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
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	Under-grad	14
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0	Non-major	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 193A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1077
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.48	4.08	3.93	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	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	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	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 193A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: HOLMES, JOEL (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1078
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.48	4.08	3.93	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1079
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1385/1412	2.50	4.38	4.06	4.01	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1381	****	4.48	4.08	3.93	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	211/1500	4.75	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1319/1517	4.17	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	4.44	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.36	4.31	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.33	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	3.00	4.42	4.41	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 205	****	3.00	4.23	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.00	4.58	4.13	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.00	4.52	4.03	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	3.00	4.49	3.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.00	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.00	4.11	3.79	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	3.90	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	3.90	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.00	4.30	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.64	4.63	4.53	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 23	5.00	4.00	4.41	4.19	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.57	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.00	4.54	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.67	4.49	4.11	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1079
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193C 0101
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1080
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193D 0101
 Title VIOLA
 Instructor: BUSCHEK, KIMBER
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1081
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1491/1517	3.50	4.61	4.65	4.62	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	5.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193F 0101
 Title ELECTRIC GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1082
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.78	4.30	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.48	4.08	3.93	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1217/1517	4.33	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1440	****	4.68	4.45	4.40	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1448	****	4.89	4.71	4.63	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1436	****	4.68	4.29	4.24	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1432	****	4.69	4.29	4.23	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	4.44	3.93	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	3.92	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.13	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	4.55	4.69	4.57	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193K 0101
 Title CLARINET
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1083
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.01	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.24	4.10	3.92	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.04	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193Q 0101
 Title SAXOPHONE
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1084
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1416/1476	3.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1410/1412	1.00	4.38	4.06	4.01	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	5.00

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	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	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193V 0101
 Title ELECTRIC BASS
 Instructor: BALDWIN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1085
 JUN 26, 2007
 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
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1086
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.48	4.08	3.93	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.24	4.10	3.92	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.37	4.02	3.87	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1087
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.38	4.06	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.48	4.08	3.93	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1353/1448	4.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1036/1432	4.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.24	4.10	3.92	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	875/1269	4.00	4.27	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.37	4.02	3.87	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 211 0101
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB IV
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1088
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	239/1522	4.81	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	89/1522	4.94	4.72	4.26	4.29	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	105/1285	4.93	4.78	4.30	4.36	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	172/1476	4.82	4.70	4.22	4.20	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	167/1412	4.75	4.38	4.06	4.00	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	168/1381	4.73	4.48	4.08	3.97	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	124/1500	4.88	4.39	4.18	4.20	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.61	4.65	4.63	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	129/1497	4.85	4.50	4.11	4.11	4.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1440	****	4.68	4.45	4.42	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1448	****	4.89	4.71	4.78	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1436	****	4.68	4.29	4.29	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1432	****	4.69	4.29	4.31	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1221	****	4.44	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	4.08	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.33	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 214 0101
 Title HIST JAZZ: ORIGINS-PRE
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1089
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	0	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	849/1522	4.30	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	8	11	4.26	864/1522	4.26	4.72	4.26	4.29	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	1	3	16	4.35	698/1285	4.35	4.78	4.30	4.36	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	945/1476	4.11	4.70	4.22	4.20	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	4	5	10	3.91	892/1412	3.91	4.38	4.06	4.00	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	17	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1381	****	4.48	4.08	3.97	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	1	4	16	4.55	444/1500	4.55	4.39	4.18	4.20	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	14	8	4.36	1193/1517	4.36	4.61	4.65	4.63	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	1	5	7	6	3.95	979/1497	3.95	4.50	4.11	4.11	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	716/1440	4.57	4.68	4.45	4.42	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	1	18	4.71	935/1448	4.71	4.89	4.71	4.78	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	636/1436	4.48	4.68	4.29	4.29	4.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	227/1432	4.86	4.69	4.29	4.31	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.44	3.93	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	803/1280	3.92	4.24	4.10	4.08	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	0	0	10	4.42	682/1277	4.42	4.54	4.34	4.33	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	501/1269	4.62	4.27	4.31	4.33	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	4.83	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 25
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
			? 2		

Course-Section: MUSC 217 0101
 Title ROCK & RELATED MUSIC
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 104
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1090
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	0	0	1	1	8	36	4.72	380/1522	4.72	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	2	4	17	22	4.24	894/1522	4.24	4.72	4.26	4.29	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	4	14	26	4.44	602/1285	4.44	4.78	4.30	4.36	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	33	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	****/1476	****	4.70	4.22	4.20	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	20	2	2	8	8	5	3.48	1177/1412	3.48	4.38	4.06	4.00	3.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	40	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/1381	****	4.48	4.08	3.97	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	2	9	35	4.72	252/1500	4.72	4.39	4.18	4.20	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	1	42	3	4.04	1375/1517	4.04	4.61	4.65	4.63	4.04	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	7	20	13	4.15	769/1497	4.15	4.50	4.11	4.11	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	0	2	42	4.83	320/1440	4.83	4.68	4.45	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	44	4.96	247/1448	4.96	4.89	4.71	4.78	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	1	7	36	4.71	357/1436	4.71	4.68	4.29	4.29	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	4	40	4.80	294/1432	4.80	4.69	4.29	4.31	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	3	7	35	4.71	144/1221	4.71	4.44	3.93	4.02	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	6	1	3	3	3	2.75	1240/1280	2.75	4.24	4.10	4.08	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	5	2	4	1	3	2.67	1260/1277	2.67	4.54	4.34	4.33	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	5	0	5	1	4	2.93	1223/1269	2.93	4.27	4.31	4.33	2.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	36	11	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.56	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	49	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.00	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	49	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	2.00	4.52	5.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	49	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	3.00	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	3.00	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.00	4.11	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	4.83	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.75	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	****	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.55	4.69	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 26
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	2	B 16	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 9	General 14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	11	D 1	Under-grad 51
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 51
				Electives	1
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	0			

Course-Section: MUSC 219 0101
 Title INTRO DIGITAL AUDIO WK
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1091
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	8	4.58	514/1522	4.58	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	454/1522	4.58	4.72	4.26	4.29	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	204/1285	4.83	4.78	4.30	4.36	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	226/1476	4.75	4.70	4.22	4.20	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	1	5	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.38	4.06	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.48	4.08	3.97	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	700/1500	4.33	4.39	4.18	4.20	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.61	4.65	4.63	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	189/1497	4.75	4.50	4.11	4.11	4.75	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	1007/1440	4.30	4.68	4.45	4.42	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1157/1448	4.50	4.89	4.71	4.78	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	825/1436	4.30	4.68	4.29	4.29	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	991/1432	4.10	4.69	4.29	4.31	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	246/1221	4.56	4.44	3.93	4.02	4.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 220 0101
 Title INTRO TO PERCUSSION EN
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1092
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.48	4.08	3.97	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.39	4.18	4.20	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.61	4.65	4.63	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.50	4.11	4.11	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.31	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.24	4.10	4.08	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.33	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.37	4.02	4.00	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	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	0				
				? 0						

Course-Section: MUSC 226 0101
 Title THEORY IV:MUSIC WRITIN
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1093
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	20	4.95	88/1522	4.95	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	75/1285	4.95	4.78	4.30	4.36	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	63/1476	4.95	4.70	4.22	4.20	4.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	191/1412	4.71	4.38	4.06	4.00	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	118/1381	4.80	4.48	4.08	3.97	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	374/1500	4.62	4.39	4.18	4.20	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	52/1497	4.95	4.50	4.11	4.11	4.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.31	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	83/1221	4.88	4.44	3.93	4.02	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	286/1280	4.67	4.24	4.10	4.08	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	290/1277	4.83	4.54	4.34	4.33	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 230 0101
 Title MUSICS OF THE WORLD
 Instructor: HUANG, YI-PING
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1094
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	2	5	12	4.18	970/1522	4.18	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	2	12	4.18	945/1522	4.18	4.72	4.26	4.29	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	6	3	10	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.78	4.30	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	735/1476	4.30	4.70	4.22	4.20	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	6	1	9	3.89	908/1412	3.89	4.38	4.06	4.00	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	519/1381	4.33	4.48	4.08	3.97	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	650/1500	4.38	4.39	4.18	4.20	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	901/1517	4.70	4.61	4.65	4.63	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	6	2	7	3.94	993/1497	3.94	4.50	4.11	4.11	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	669/1440	4.62	4.68	4.45	4.42	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	247/1448	4.95	4.89	4.71	4.78	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	672/1436	4.45	4.68	4.29	4.29	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	802/1432	4.35	4.69	4.29	4.31	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	156/1221	4.70	4.44	3.93	4.02	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	566/1280	4.29	4.24	4.10	4.08	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1277	4.86	4.54	4.34	4.33	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	277/1269	4.86	4.27	4.31	4.33	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	141/ 854	4.67	4.37	4.02	4.00	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 1		

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101
 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1095
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	2	15	4.72	365/1522	4.72	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	179/1522	4.83	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1285	****	4.78	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	178/1476	4.80	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	14	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1500	****	4.39	4.18	4.13	****	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	932/1517	4.67	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	164/1497	4.79	4.50	4.11	4.13	4.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1436	4.86	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	227/1432	4.86	4.69	4.29	4.29	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	****	4.44	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.24	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	527/1277	4.60	4.54	4.34	4.38	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1269	4.80	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.55	4.69	4.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MUSC 303 0101
 Title MD CAMERATA--CHAMBER C
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1096
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	18	4.78	275/1522	4.78	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	115/1522	4.91	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.78	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	758/1476	4.29	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	21	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1412	****	4.38	4.06	4.03	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	21	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1381	****	4.48	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	11	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	349/1500	4.64	4.39	4.18	4.13	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	17	5	4.17	1313/1517	4.17	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	104/1497	4.90	4.50	4.11	4.13	4.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1221	****	4.44	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 22	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0	Graduate	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 4	D 0	Under-grad	23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 304 0101
 Title UMBC JUBILEE SINGERS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1097
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	260/1522	4.79	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	0	23	4.88	149/1522	4.88	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	150/1285	4.91	4.78	4.30	4.30	4.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	245/1476	4.73	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	430/1412	4.40	4.38	4.06	4.03	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1070/1381	3.71	4.48	4.08	4.13	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	0	1	2	1	16	4.60	387/1500	4.60	4.39	4.18	4.13	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	16	4.67	932/1517	4.67	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	181/1497	4.76	4.50	4.11	4.13	4.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	304/1440	4.83	4.68	4.45	4.46	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	683/1448	4.83	4.89	4.71	4.71	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	254/1432	4.83	4.69	4.29	4.29	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	6	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1221	****	4.44	3.93	3.94	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	357/1280	4.56	4.24	4.10	4.14	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	547/1269	4.56	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.00	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	3.00	4.42	4.35	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.00	4.52	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.00	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.00	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.00	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.55	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.67	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 304 0101
 Title UMBC JUBILEE SINGERS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1097
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	25	Non-major	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 307A 0101
 Title JAZZ IMPROV
 Instructor: LAGANA, TOM
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1098
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.75	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.48	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.39	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.13	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	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 307D 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1099
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.50	4.11	4.13	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307F 0101
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1100
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.13	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1 Under-grad 4 Non-major 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 307G 0101
 Title COLLEGIUM
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1101
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.48	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.13	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.50	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.29	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.24	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.37	4.02	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 307K 0101
 Title VOCAL ARTS ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID A
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1102
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1500	****	4.39	4.18	4.13	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.13	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	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	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 5 Non-major 1
84-150	0	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 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 307L 0101
 Title COLLABORATIVE PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1103
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.39	4.18	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	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	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 308 0101
 Title UMBC WIND ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: VILLANEUVA, JAR
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1104
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	1	5	4.38	767/1522	4.38	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.78	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.13	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	973/1517	4.63	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	481/1497	4.43	4.50	4.11	4.13	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.29	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 309 0101
 Title UMBC NEW MUSIC ENSEMBL
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1105
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	2	0	8	4.36	779/1522	4.36	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	623/1522	4.45	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1412	****	4.38	4.06	4.03	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1381	****	4.48	4.08	4.13	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	6	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.39	4.18	4.13	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	296/1497	4.63	4.50	4.11	4.13	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1404/1440	3.00	4.68	4.45	4.46	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1436	****	4.68	4.29	4.30	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1432	****	4.69	4.29	4.29	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	530/1280	4.33	4.24	4.10	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 11	Non-major 4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 1	Other 6		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 311 0101
 Title FREE COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1106
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	760/1412	4.00	4.38	4.06	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.48	4.08	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1430/1500	3.00	4.39	4.18	4.13	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.13	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.24	4.10	4.14	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	4.37	4.02	4.00	3.00

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	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	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 313 0101
 Title ADVANCED GAMELAN
 Instructor: BECK, GINA C
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1107
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	0	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	1234/1522	3.88	4.73	4.30	4.34	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	874/1522	4.25	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.78	4.30	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	703/1476	4.33	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	493/1412	4.33	4.38	4.06	4.03	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	519/1381	4.33	4.48	4.08	4.13	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.39	4.18	4.13	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	555/1517	4.88	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.50	4.11	4.13	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	832/1221	3.67	4.44	3.93	3.94	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.38	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.27	4.31	4.39	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	141/ 854	4.67	4.37	4.02	4.00	4.67	

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 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 9 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 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 319 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS IN MUSIC TE
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1108
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.75	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.48	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.13	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1346/1497	3.33	4.50	4.11	4.13	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.29	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.24	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.37	4.02	4.00	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	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	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 322 0101
 Title: MUSIC HISTORY II
 Instructor: COX, FRANKLIN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1109
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	4	10	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	811/1522	4.31	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.78	4.30	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	660/1476	4.38	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	305/1412	4.56	4.38	4.06	4.03	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	673/1381	4.19	4.48	4.08	4.13	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	630/1500	4.40	4.39	4.18	4.13	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1262/1517	4.27	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	0	2	11	4.40	506/1497	4.40	4.50	4.11	4.13	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	931/1440	4.40	4.68	4.45	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.90	494/1448	4.90	4.89	4.71	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	934/1436	4.20	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	527/1432	4.60	4.69	4.29	4.29	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	213/1221	4.60	4.44	3.93	3.94	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	5	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 323 0101
 Title CAREER DEV FOR MUSICI
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1110
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	8	4.67	433/1522	4.67	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1285	****	4.78	4.30	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	172/1476	4.82	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.38	4.06	4.03	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.48	4.08	4.13	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1253/1500	3.63	4.39	4.18	4.13	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	147/1497	4.80	4.50	4.11	4.13	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1436	4.88	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1432	4.88	4.69	4.29	4.29	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	207/1280	4.78	4.24	4.10	4.14	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	245/1277	4.89	4.54	4.34	4.38	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	157/ 854	4.63	4.37	4.02	4.00	4.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	3.00	4.58	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	3.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.00	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.00	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.00	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.55	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.00	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.67	4.49	****	****	

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	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	5	
?	0			

Course-Section: MUSC 385 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE CONDUCTIN
 Instructor: MCCOY, MARK
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1111
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.75	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1476	4.75	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.38	4.06	4.03	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.48	4.08	4.13	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	780/1500	4.25	4.39	4.18	4.13	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.50	4.11	4.13	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.68	4.45	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1436	4.67	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	454/1432	4.67	4.69	4.29	4.29	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	3.94	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.24	4.10	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.38	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.37	4.02	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 1
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 390B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1112
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	1	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1485/1500	2.00	4.39	4.18	4.13	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	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	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	1	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 390B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1113
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	4.50	605/1522	4.50	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1485/1500	2.00	4.39	4.18	4.13	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.13	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	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	1	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 390F 0101
 Title ELECTRIC GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1114
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	3	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.48	4.08	4.13	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.13	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	932/1517	4.67	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.13	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.29	5.00	

Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.64	4.63	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.75	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 390X 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: COX, FRANKLIN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1115
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.39	4.18	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.50

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390X 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1116
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.34	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.39	4.18	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.13	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 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 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0101
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1117
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	4.80	246/1522	4.90	4.73	4.30	4.42	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	432/1522	4.80	4.72	4.26	4.34	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	4.78	4.30	4.42	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1412	4.50	4.38	4.06	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	211/1500	4.88	4.39	4.18	4.25	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	994/1517	4.80	4.61	4.65	4.71	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	147/1497	4.90	4.50	4.11	4.21	4.80

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

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0201
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS
 Instructor: WANNEBERGER, A
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1118
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	4.90	4.73	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	4.80	4.72	4.26	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.38	4.06	4.11	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.48	4.08	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	4.88	4.39	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	4.80	4.61	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1497	4.90	4.50	4.11	4.21	5.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	4.04	5.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1277/1280	1.00	4.24	4.10	4.28	1.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1268/1269	1.00	4.27	4.31	4.49	1.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.37	4.02	4.31	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 401 0101
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS: COMP
 Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1119
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.42	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.48	4.08	4.21	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.71	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	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 401 0101
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS: COMP
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1120
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.42	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.48	4.08	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.25	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.21	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	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 418 0101
 Title MUSIC TECH. INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1121
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.42	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.48	4.08	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.21	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	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 428 0101
 Title ELECTRONIC MUSIC
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1122
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.72	4.26	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.78	4.30	4.42	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.70	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	339/1412	4.50	4.38	4.06	4.11	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.48	4.08	4.21	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1298/1500	3.50	4.39	4.18	4.25	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.61	4.65	4.71	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.50	4.11	4.21	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.68	4.45	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.68	4.29	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.24	4.10	4.28	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.54	4.34	4.50	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.37	4.02	4.31	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 480 0101
 Title TOPICS IN MUSC/ART/SOC
 Instructor: TANOSAKI, KAZUK
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1123
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	5	4.83	225/1522	4.83	4.73	4.30	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.72	4.26	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	833/1285	4.17	4.78	4.30	4.42	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	892/1476	4.17	4.70	4.22	4.31	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.38	4.06	4.11	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	693/1381	4.17	4.48	4.08	4.21	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.39	4.18	4.25	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.61	4.65	4.71	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.50	4.11	4.21	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	859/1448	4.75	4.89	4.71	4.75	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.68	4.29	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	884/1432	4.25	4.69	4.29	4.34	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	4.04	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	959/1280	3.67	4.24	4.10	4.28	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.54	4.34	4.50	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1156/1269	3.33	4.27	4.31	4.49	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.37	4.02	4.31	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 492 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: KIM BOYLE, DAV
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 1124
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	4	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.73	4.30	4.42	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1522	4.80	4.72	4.26	4.34	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1412	****	4.38	4.06	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1500	4.80	4.39	4.18	4.25	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.61	4.65	4.71	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.21	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
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	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	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	5				
				?	0						