Course-Section: MUSC 100 0101
Title INTRO TO MUSIC
Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH

196

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 77

0

Grad.

3.50-4.00 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1039 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did you	gain ne	w insights,ski	ills fro	m 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	instruc	tor make clear	c the ex	pected 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 qu	estions reflec	ct the e	xpected 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	er evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	3	49	2	1	1	6	15	4.24	815/1476	4.24	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.24
5. Did ass:	igned re	adings contrib	oute 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
5. Did wri	tten ass	ignments contr	ribute t	o what you learned	3	61	2	1	0	3	7	3.92	****/1381	****	4.48	4.08	3.93	****
7. Was the	grading	system clearl	ly expla	ined	2	0	1	1	8	14	51	4.51	483/1500	4.51	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.51
8. How many	y times	was class cand	celled		3	1	0	0	0	64	9	4.12	1343/1517	4.12	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.12
9. How would	ld you g	rade the overa	all teac	hing effectiveness	19	1	0	1	6	32	18	4.18	744/1497	4.18	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.18
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture			4	0	0	0	1	6	66	4.89	208/1440	4.89	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.89
2. Did the	instruc	tor seem inter	cested i	n 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 lect	ture mat	erial presente	ed and e	xplained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	8	63	4.82	198/1436	4.82	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.82
. Did the	lecture	s contribute t	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
. Did aud:	iovisual	techniques er	nhance y	our understanding	4	2	1	1	4	8	57	4.68	168/1221	4.68	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.68
		Discus	ssion															
				what you learned	54	0	5	2	4	5	7		1117/1280		4.24	4.10	3.92	3.30
2. Were al	l studen	ts actively er	ncourage	d 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	instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d 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 spe	ecial te	chniques succe	essful		51	22	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****
		Labora	atory															
2. Were you	u provid	ed with adequa	ate back	ground information	76	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.33	****
		Semina	ar															
. Were as	signed t	opics relevant	t to the	announced theme	74	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	3.00	4.58	4.13	***
2. Was the	instruc	tor available	for ind	ividual attention	75	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	2.00	4.52	4.03	***
. Were cr	iteria f	or grading mad	de clear		75	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.00	4.11	3.79	****
		Field	Work															
L. Did fie	ld exper	ience contribu	ate to w	hat you learned	76	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you	clearly	understand yo	our eval	uation criteria	76	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the	instruc	tor available	for con	sultation	76	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	***
1. To what	degree	could you disc	cuss you	r evaluations	76	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.00	***
		Self																
	_	_		what you learned	75	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 37		4.64	4.63	4.53	***
2. Did stud	dy quest	ions make clea	ar the e	xpected goal	74	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	***
3. Were you	ur conta	cts with the i	instruct	or helpful	74	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 33	****	4.55	4.69	4.57	***
4. Was the	feedbac	k/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	74	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	4.00	4.54	4.31	***
5. Were the	ere enou	gh proctors fo	or all t	he students	74	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.67	4.49	4.11	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ear	rned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 6 0.00-0.99 0 A 38					Red	 guir	 ed f	or M	aior	 s 4	3	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	 0	
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	В 14				_		- ,	-) (-
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C 4		Ger	nera	1			1	4	Under-9	rad 5	77	Non-	-major	77
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	11	D 0		001	u.	-				-	onacr g			1,011		. ,
04-150	10	3.00-3.49	1.2	D 0								2	шшшш					

Electives

3

- Means there are not enough

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

Title FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR

Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE

Enrollment: 67
Questionnaires: 26

Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1040 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5		tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		4.72	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			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		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		4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3		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		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		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		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		****/ 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	****
Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
										- 				
00-27 4 0.00-0.99 0 A 16		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	6	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	2
28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 6		~		.] A Hadan anad 26 Name					0.4					
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 7 C 2		Ger	nera.	T		4 Under-grad 26 Non-ma				major	24			
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 5 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I 0		Oth	ner											

?

1

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

			Fre	quer	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	0	4	9		4.61		4.60	4.78	4.30		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		4.70	275/1500	4.50	4.39	4.18		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	_								000 /4 4 4 0					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	16	23	4.44		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		4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	7	9		4.40	766/1432	4.46	4.69	4.29		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		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	4.13	4.28
4. Were special techniques successful	30	8	1	0	1	1	7		****/ 854	3.75 ****	4.27	4.02	3.87	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	30	0		U			,	4.30	/ 654		4.37	4.02	3.07	
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		****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	3.00	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 216	****	3.00	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 205	****	3.00		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		****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	0	1		, -	****	3.00	4.30	3.90	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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		****/ 18	****	3.67		4.11	****
		-	-	-	-	-	_		, 10					

Title FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR

Instructor:

Enrollment: 81 Questionnaires: 48

Baltimore County HAWLEY, THOMAS Spring 2007

Page 1041 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	32	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 111 0101 University of Maryland Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB II Baltimore County Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW Spring 2007

Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 13 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies I					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	Λ	Λ	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	4.73	4.73	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	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	7	7	4.70	285/1476	4.95	4.70	4.22	4.22	4.70
<u> </u>	1	9	0	0	0	3	2		285/14/6 ****/1412	4.81	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.67	289/1381	4.86	4.38	4.08	3.93	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	0	3	-	4.33	700/1500	4.78	4.48	4.08	4.16	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	0	0	10	5			4.25			4.16	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	-	0	0	-	Τ0	2		1319/1517		4.61	4.65		4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	U	U	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	Ο	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		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	n	1	<u> </u>	2		****/1221	4.60	4.44	3.93	3.86	****
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	,		U	U	_	U	2	1.55	/ 1221	1.00	1.11	3.93	3.00	
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	****
-														
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	=			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 111 0201 University of Maryl Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB II Baltimore County Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW Spring 2007

Enrollment:

19

University of Maryland Page 1043
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Ω	uestionnaires:	14	St.udent.	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions		MB	NA		_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean			
		Quescion																
		Genera	1															
1. Die	d you gain :	new insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	275/1522	4.73	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.79
2. Dic	d the instr	uctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1522	4.83	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00
3. Dic	d the exam	questions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1285	4.95	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Dic	d other eva	luations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	112/1476	4.81	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.92
5. Dic	d assigned	readings contrib	ute 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. Dic	d written a	ssignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1		0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1381	4.78	4.48	4.08	3.93	5.00
7. Was	s the gradi	ng system clearl	y expla	ined	2	2	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	160/1500	4.57	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.80
		s was class cand			1	1	0	0	0	8			1217/1517		4.61	4.65	4.62	4.33
9. Hov	w would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	134/1497	4.75	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.83
		Lectur																
		ructor's lecture			5	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	740/1440		4.68	4.45	4.40	4.56
		uctor seem inter			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		1/1436		4.68	4.29	4.24	
		res contribute t		-	5	0	0	0	0	0	9		1/1432		4.69	4.29	4.23	
5. Dic	d audiovisu	al techniques en	hance y	our understanding	5	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	213/1221	4.60	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.60
		Discus				_		_		_								
				what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1280				3.92	4.60
				d to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00
		_		d open discussion	9	0	1	0	1	0	3		1002/1269	4.30	4.27	4.31	4.04	3.80
4. Wei	re special	techniques succe	sstul		9	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****
				_			,											
				Frequ	lency	Dis	tribi	ıtıoı	1									
Credit	ts Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons Type					pe			Majors	3			
00-27	7 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	 or	9
28-55	5 1	1.00-1.99	0	в 4														
56-83		2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	-major	5
84-15	50 3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	Grad. 0 $3.50-4.00$ 4 F 1 Electives 0 $\#\#\#$ - Mean							_	jh									
				P 0					responses to be		e sign	nificar	ıt					
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	2						
				? 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
---------	--------	------------	---------------

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	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	1	5.00	1/1497	4.86	4.50	4.11	4.02	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0601 University of Maryland Page 1045 MUSIC REPERTOIRE Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029 LAGANA, THOMAS

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	10			
Questionnaires:	10	Student Cour	rse Evaluation	Questionnaire

Title

Instructor:

						cque	IICIC	_		1110	LIUCCOI	COULDC	DCPC	OTTEC	TC / CI	DCCC		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	492/1522	4.80	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.60
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1522			4.26	4.18	5.00
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	228/1285	4.90	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.80
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	125/1476	4.95	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.90
				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 wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0 6	4	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	331/1381	4.50	4.48	4.08	3.93	4.50
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1161/1517	4.20	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.40
				hing effectivenes	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	223/1497	4.86	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.71
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.50
		ctor seem inter			6		0	0	0	1		4.75					4.63	
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0						4.75					4.24	
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0			4.50						4.50
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand					0	0	0	0	1		4.80						
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	laga diga			what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.40	477/1280	4 40	1 21	4 10	2 02	4.40
				d to participate	5	0						5.00						5.00
				d open discussion			0	0	0			5.00			4.27		4.04	
		echniques succe		d open discussion	5		0	1	1	0		4.00						
1. Wele a	Special c	cemmiques succe	BBLUI		5	Ü	O	_	_	Ü	5	1.00	120/ 051	1.00	1.57	1.02	3.07	1.00
				Free	quenc	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	5			Rea	ason	s			Тур	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		 Re	quir	ed f	or M	 aior	 `S	0	Graduate		0	Maic	 or	9
28-55							quil		O	w	_		or adda o	_	•			
56-83							nera	1				0	Under-gi	rad 1	.0	Non-	-major	1
84-150												-	- 2- 3-		-			_
Grad.	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_i h		
		3.50-4.00	2	P 0									response					•
				I O		Ot	her					7	_		5			
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 126 0101
Title THEORY II:FORM&ANALYSI

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1046 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

	Questions						Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescion			1417	NA												
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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 instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected 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 q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected 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 eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected 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 r	eadings contrib	ute 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 as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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 gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	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 canc	elled		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 overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	223/1497	3.86	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.71
		Lecture																
			4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	336/1440		4.68	4.45	4.40	4.82		
	the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	494/1448		4.89	4.71	4.63	4.91
				xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	7	4		762/1436		4.68	4.29	4.24	4.36
		es contribute t		_	4	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	632/1432		4.69	4.29	4.23	4.50
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	5	3	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	606/1221	4.12	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.00
1 1		Discus			_	0	0	•	-	-	_	4 60	211/1000	4 10	4 0 4	4 10	2 00	4 60
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	311/1280		4.24	4.10	3.92	4.63
				d to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	508/1277		4.54	4.34	4.13	4.63
				d open discussion	7 7	0 3	0	1	0	2	6	4.75 3.60	381/1269 652/ 854		4.27	4.31	4.04	4.75 3.60
4. were	special t	echniques succe	SSIUI		/	3	U	Т	Т	4	1	3.60	052/ 854	3.40	4.37	4.02	3.87	3.60
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		_							1		_			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	4
84-150		3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
			3.50-4.00 3 F 0 P 0										respons	es to b	e sign	uficar	ıt	

Other

10

0

1

I ? Course-Section: MUSC 126 0201

THEORY II: FORM&ANALYSI

Title

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

			Fre	eaner	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General	0	0	2	2	_	4	4	2 22	1460/1500	4 00	4 72	4 20	1 11	2 22
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3 2	2	5 7	4 1	4		1468/1522 1451/1522		4.73 4.72	4.30	4.14 4.18	3.22 3.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	3	9		1034/1285	4.28	4.72	4.26	4.18	3.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	<i>5</i>	5		1275/1476		4.70	4.22	4.22	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	4	7		948/1412		4.70	4.22	4.09	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	4	2	3	6		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		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	-		983/1517		4.61	4.65	4.62	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	3	6	1	3		1418/1497		4.50	4.11		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		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		****/ 217	****	3.00	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	3.00	,	****	3.00	4.58	4.13	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	***	2.00	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	,	****	3.00	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17 17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78 ****/ 80	****	3.00	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1/	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	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		****/ 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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 170 0101 University of Maryland Title BEGINNING VOICE CLASS

JACKSON, JANICE

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1048

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ρ

I

?

0

0

	Ouestions									_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level	
			Questions	5			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	1																
1. 1	Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		this cour	rse	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	453/1522	4.64	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.64
	_	_	ctor make clear				0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	299/1522	4.71	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.71
3. 1	Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflect	t the exp	pected goa	als	0	7	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	318/1285	4.71	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.71
4.	Did oth	her eval	uations reflect	the exp	ected goal	ls	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	100/1476	4.93	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.93
5.	Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to w	hat you le	earned	0	1	2	1	1	3	6	3.77	1005/1412	3.77	4.38	4.06	4.01	3.77
6. 1	Did wr:	itten as:	signments contr	ibute 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	e grading	g system clearly	y explai	ned		0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	950/1500	4.07	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.07
8. 1	How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled			1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	623/1517	4.85	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.85
9. 1	How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effect	tiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.50
			Lecture	е																
1. 1	Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture:	s well p	repared		1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	763/1440	4.54	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.54
2.	Did the	e instru	structor seem interested in the subject e material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	395/1448	4.92	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.92
3. 1	Was le	lecture material presented and explained clearly				learly	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	564/1436	4.54	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.54
4.	Did the	the lectures contribute to what you learned				d	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 understandi					tanding	2	3	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	480/1221	4.22	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.22
			Discus																	
			ussions contrib		-		6	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	499/1280		4.24	4.10	3.92	4.38
			nts actively end				6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1277		4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00
			ctor encourage :		open disc	cussion	6	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1269			4.31	4.04	5.00
4. 1	Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful			6	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	121/ 854	4.71	4.37	4.02	3.87	4.71
			Self 1																	
		_	system contrib		_		12	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 37		4.64		4.53	****
			tions make clear			al	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23		4.00	4.41	4.19	***
	_		acts with the in		_		12	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.00	****/ 33		4.55	4.69	4.57	***
			ck/tutoring by p	-	-		13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 22		4.00	4.54	4.31	****
5. 1	Were th	here eno	ugh proctors for	r all th	e students	S	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	3.67	4.49	4.11	***
						Freq	uency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Cre	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr									Rea	asons	3			Т	рe			Majors	;
0.0	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 11							Red	auire	ed fo	or Ma	ior		1	Graduat	 .e	0	Majo	 or	0
	28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 0											. ,	-	-	~~~	-	-	- 100) 0		ŭ
	5-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0							Ger	nera:	1				8	Under-	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	14
		5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0										_			3	
	84-150 5 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0							Ele	ectiv	ves				5	#### -	Means t	here a		_	rh

Other

0

Course-Section: MUSC 171 0101 Title

INTERMEDIATE VOICE CLA

Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 1049 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	Λ	0	0	Λ	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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 172B 0101 University of Maryla
Title Baltimore County
Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE Spring 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

2

University of Maryland Page 1050
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestion	naire
Deadcire	COULDC	DValaacion	Queberon	.iuii c

	Ouestions							-	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	_	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00
-	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522		4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1430/1500	3.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	3.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00
	ow would you grade the overall teaching effective					0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.50
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00		
	ere the instructor's lectures well prepared id the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00
						0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1432		4.69	4.29	4.23	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	3.86	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d 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	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1207/1269	3.00	4.27	4.31	4.04	3.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	:
																		,
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		_						_			_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					0						

0

Course-Section: MUSC 175 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE VOCAL MET

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1051

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 8

84-150

Grad.

3

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

1

3

D

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	N	R	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General		^	^	0	1	_	2	_	2 75	1005/1500	2 75	4 72	4 20	4 1 4	2 75
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this cours		0	0	U	1	2	3	2		1295/1522		4.73	4.30	4.14	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0 3	0	T	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 goal		0	3	0	0	0	3	∠ 3	4.40	650/1285 913/1476	4.40 4.14	4.78 4.70	4.30	4.22	4.40 4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you lea		0	4	0	0	1	∠ 1	2	4.14		4.14	4.70	4.22	4.09 4.01	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you lead to be a signment of the contribute to what you		1	3	0	0	1	2	1	4.25	,	4.25	4.38	4.08	3.93	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.40	4.18	4.16	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled		1	0	0	0	0	5	2		1251/1517	4.29	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effect:	irronoga	4	1	0	0	1	2	0		1204/1497	3.67	4.50	4.11		3.67
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effect.	1 velless	4	1	U	U	1	4	U	3.07	1204/149/	3.07	4.50	4.11	4.02	3.07
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	ct	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 cle		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 understa		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 lea	arned	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 partic	ipate	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 disc	ussion	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	****
	Frequen	су	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected	Grades				Rea	sons	;			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A	5		Req	uire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	6
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B	0		_	_						1	,				
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C	0		Gen	eral	-				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	2

Electives

Other

1

3

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

BEGINNING KEYBOARD SKI

Title BEITH, NANCY S

Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1052 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank			Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44			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	,	4.83	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2		4.83	. ,		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		4.75	211/1500		4.39	4.18	4.16	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	6		1185/1517		4.61	4.65		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 2	0	0	0	0	0	2	F 00	++++/1/1/0	4 25	1 (0	4 45	4 40	****
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1440	4.25	4.68	4.45	4.40	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0 0	0	0 0	0	3		****/1448	4.40	4.89	4.71 4.29	4.63	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13 13	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1436 ****/1432	4.50 3.75	4.68 4.69	4.29	4.24 4.23	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	0	0	0	2		****/1221	3.75	4.69	3.93	3.86	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	/1221	3.07	4.44	3.93	3.00	
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		****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****
i. Note special committee successful		ŭ	Ü	Ū	Ū	Ü	_	3.00	, 001		1.57	1.02	3.07	
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		****/ 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		****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	3.90	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	****
0.15 7 1														
Self Paced	1 2	0	0	0	1	^	0	4 22	****/ 27		1 (1	4 62	4 52	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	4.53	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	-	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 23 ****/ 33	****	4.00	4.41	4.19	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13 14	0 1	0	0	1	1 0	1 1	4.00	****/ 33 ****/ 22	****	4.55	4.69	4.57	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	2	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 18			4.54 4.49	4.31 4.11	****
J. Here there enough procedus for all the schuells	13	۷	J	J	U	U	Т	5.00	/ 10		3.07	ユ・ サジ	4.11	

Title BEGINNING KEYBOARD SKI

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 16

BEITH, NANCY S Enrollment: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1052 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Title BEGINNING KEYBOARD SKI

BEITH, NANCY S

Instructor:

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1053 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	225/1522	4.64	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.83
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	179/1522	4.76	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.83
		uestions reflect			0	4	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	278/1285	4.83	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.75
		uations reflect			1	3	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1476	4.92	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00
				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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	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 th	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ained	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	444/1500	4.65	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.55
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	1	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1241/1517	4.34	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.30
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	833/1497	4.17	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.10
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	s well	prepared	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1047/1440	4.25	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.25
		ctor seem inter			7	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1241/1448	4.40	4.89	4.71	4.63	4.40
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	2	2	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.50
4. Did th	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1191/1432	3.75	4.69	4.29	4.23	3.75
	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						1	0	0	0	2		832/1221				3.86	3.67
Discussion																		
1 Did cl	ass disci			what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	3.92	****
				ed to participate	11	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.13	****
				nd open discussion	11	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****
		Labora	oru															
2 Were v	ou provid		_	ground information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.33	****
_	_	_		for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	3.00	4.51	4.51	****
	_	structor provide			11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 216	****	3.00		4.41	****
		Field N	Jorde															
1 Did fi	old ormon			what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	3.90	****
				luation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	3.00	4.41	3.90	****
Z. DIG YO	ou clearly	y understand you	ır eval	luation criteria	11	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 45		3.00	4.30	3.90	
1 541	161	Self 1			11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 27		1 61	4 62	4 52	***
	_	-		what you learned	11	0	0	0	•	1	0		****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	4.53	****
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the in	istruct	or helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	4.55	4.69	4.57	***
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	 0	A 7					or Ma			0	Cradust		0			9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		кес	quir	eu L	DT MG	JOE	D	U	Graduat	E	U	Majo	JΙ	פ
26-33 56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Cor	nara	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	2	Non	-major	3
84-150	2		0	D 0	General							U	onder-9	rau I	4	INOI1-	iiia JUL	3
						וק.	ecti	760				0	#### _	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0				Electives					-		- Means there are not enough onses to be significant				1++			
I 0					∩+1	her					8	T Caboura	CD CO L	5191.	LLLCal			
				Δ 0		ULI	TTCT					J						

Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County INTERM KEYBOARD SKILLS

Title Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S Spring 2007

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 8

4. Were special techniques successful

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1054

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	3.92	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate			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	****

Frequency Distribution

7 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 854 **** 4.37 4.02 3.87 ****

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

Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0201 University of Maryland
Title INTERM KEYBOARD SKILLS Baltimore County
Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S Spring 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

7

University of Maryland Page 1055
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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		****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.13	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	1	0	0	0	0		****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were special techniques successful		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****
*														

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

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0101 University of Maryland Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1056

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S Enrollment: 22

3.50-4.00

6

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Questionnaires: 19

Grad.

0

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fr	eque	ncie	e e		Tnet	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
1 54		Genera	_		0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4 27	779/1522	4 20	4 72	4 20	1 11	4 27
		ew insights,ski			0	-	•	0	4	4	1.4	4.37	465/1522	4.39	4.73 4.72	4.30	4.14 4.18	4.37 4.58
		ctor make clear		_	0	0	0	0	3	2	14 15		,					
	_	uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	-	3		4.68	347/1285	4.74	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.68
		uations reflect			0	2	0	1	1	Τ	14	4.65	336/1476		4.70	4.22	4.09	4.65
				what you learned	0	6	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	585/1412		4.38	4.06	4.01	4.23
		_		to what you learned	0	12	1	1	0	2	3		1070/1381		4.48	4.08	3.93	3.71
	_	g system clearl		ained	0	1	1	3	4	2	8		1204/1500		4.39	4.18	4.16	3.72
	_	was class canc			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 overa	ll tead	ching 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						0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	320/1440	4.79	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.82
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	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 ma	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	151/1436	4.84	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.88
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	267/1432	4.63	4.69	4.29	4.23	4.82
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	2	4	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	532/1221	4.38	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.15
		Discus	gion															
1 Did	clace diec			what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	644/1280	3.92	4.24	4.10	3.92	4.17
				ed to participate	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	867/1277	4.25	4.54	4.34	4.13	4.17
				nd open discussion	13	0	2	0	1	1	2		1194/1269	2.75	4.27	4.31	4.04	3.17
		echniques succe		id open discussion	13	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 854		4.37	4.02	3.87	****
				P		- D												
Fre							trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	ason	S			Ту	ре			Majors	3
00-27	1	1 0.00-0.99 0 A 17					quir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	`====	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 2							-			_						3		
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 3 C 0					Gei	nera	1			1	.5	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	19	
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 3 D 0											-	-			-		5 2	
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 3 D 0						_									_			_

Electives

Other

3

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS

BEITH, NANCY S Instructor:

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1057 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	707/1522		4.73		4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2		4.79	222/1522		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		4.78	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		4.70	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		4.38	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			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	4.00	4.54	4.31	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utior	n									

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_	_		
				?	0						

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

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1058 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did voi	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	548/1522	4 56	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.56
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	488/1522	4.56	4.72	4.26	4.18	4.56
		uestions reflec			0	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	706/1285	4.33	4.78	4.30	4.22	4.33
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	207/1476	4.78	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.78
				what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	1	1		1013/1412		4.38	4.06	4.01	3.75
				o what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	0	3		1119/1381		4.48	4.08	3.93	3.63
		g system clearl			0	0	0	2	_	3	3		1168/1500		4.39	4.18	4.16	3.78
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	5			1185/1517	4.38	4.61	4.65		4.38
	-			hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	3		654/1497		4.50	4.11		4.25
y. 110.11 1100	, Lu 70u 3	grade one overa	0000	ming directiveness	_	Ü	Ü	ŭ	_	-		1.25	031,113.	1125	1.50		1.02	1.25
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	uctor's lecture	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	e instruc	n 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 led	cture mat	xplained 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	e lecture	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 aud	diovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	3	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	500/1221	4.20	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.20
		Discus																
				what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/1280		4.24		3.92	****
				d to participate	7	•	0	1	1	0	0		****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.13	****
		_		d open discussion	7		0	1	1	0	0		****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****
				Frequ	ong	. Diat	- r i bı	1+101	_									
				rrequ	епсу	DISC		10101	.1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	рe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Rec	 mii r		or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 _	0	Majo		0
28-55							1411	-u 1	OT 1-10	، ١٠٠٠	,	J	Graduati	_	•	1.10) (/ <u>_</u>	J
	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						nera:	L				9	Under-q	rad	9	Non-	-major	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		001		_				-	011401 9		-	2.021		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
	-	2.22 2.30	-	P 0									respons				_	•
				I O		Oth	ıer					0		~	9**		-	
				? 1		001						•						

Course-Section: MUSC 183 0101 University of Maryland Page 1059 Title Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 INTERM STRING CLASS Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: LADD, GITA

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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

Credits E	arned	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	В	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 183 0201 University of Maryland Title INTERM STRING CLASS Baltimore County Instructor: LADD, GITA

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

6

JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 1060

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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		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														
	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.24	4.10	3 92	5.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.24	4.10	3.92 4.13	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/12//		4.54	4.34	4.13	5.00
	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.27	4.02	3.87	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.3/	4.02	3.87	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				2	0						

University of Maryland Page 1061
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

G 1 1 1	~			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestion	naire

Course-Section: MUSC 189 0101

13

GUITAR CLASS

FORSHEE, ZANE

Title

Instructor:
Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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 th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1476	4.75	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.75
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1412	****	4.38	4.06	4.01	****
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1381	****	4.48	4.08	3.93	****
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	211/1500	4.75	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.75
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.25
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instr	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00		
2. Did th	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clea:						0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	5.00
4. Did th	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.23	5.00
5. Did au	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	3.86	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful		3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	3.87	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	·												Graduat		 0			
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		ке	quire	eu I	or Ma	ajors		0	Graduat	е	U	Majo) T	0
28-55 56-83						Ca	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	5	Mos	major	5
84-150							nera.	L				т	onder-g	ıau	S	NOI1-	·iia Jor	5
Grad.							ectiv	TO G				3	#### - 1	Moona t	horo a	ro not	onous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	U	P 0		ъT	CCCIV	/CD				5	respons				_	111
				I O		O+.	her					0	respons	בם נט ג	e sigi	.rrrcan	1.0	
				T 0		UL.	mer					U						

?

0

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0101 University of Maryland Page 1062 Title PIANO Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007

Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACH (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 12

Questionnaires: 7

Spring 2007 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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	***
Frequ	ency.	Dist	cribu	utio	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	Λ						

Title PIANO Instructor:

Enrollment:

HAWLEY, THOMAS (Instr. B)

12

Spring 2007 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1063 JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Ouestionnaires: 7 Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 6 4.862. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.714. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 5 0 0 0 0 2 5.000 0 0 0 1 6 4.86 211/1522 4.86 4.73 4.30 4.14 4.86 0 0 2 5 4.71 299/1522 4.71 4.72 4.26 4.18 4.71 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 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 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 **** 1 5.00 ****/1448 **** 4.89 4.71 4.63 **** 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 0 0 0 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 Ω 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 1/ 37 5.00 4.64 4.63 4.53 5.00 0 3 5.00 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 5 1 0 0 4.00 ****/ 23 **** 4.00 4.41 4.19 **** 0 1 5 0 0 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 33 5.00 4.55 4.69 4.57 5.00 5 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 22 **** 4.00 4.54 4.31 **** 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 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 ****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	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	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Title VOICE

HUBBARD, JOYCE (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 4

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1064

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		4.73	4.30	4.14	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285		4.72	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		4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	3		1080/1517		4.70	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	4.11	4.02	4.50
7. now would you grade the overall teaching circultable	2	O	U	Ü	O	_	_	1.50	303/117/	1.50	1.50	1.11	1.02	1.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	1		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		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		1056/1436		4.68	4.29	4.24	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1		1036/1432		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		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		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
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	3	U	U	U	Τ.	U	U	3.00	707 00	3.00	3.00	4.11	3.75	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		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		3.67	4.49	4.11	3.00

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Title VOICE

Instructor:

SMITH, DAVID (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 4

Spring 2007

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1065 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				Frequenci		s		Inst	ructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Leve		Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
~														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	_	5.00	1/1436	4.50	4.68		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		4.23	4.50
1. Did the rectard contribute to what you rearned	5	Ü	O	0	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	1/1132	1.50	1.05	1.27	1.23	1.50
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		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		4.00	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		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

Title VOICE

Questionnaires: 4

Enrollment:

Instructor: SMITH, DAVID (Instr. B)

12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1065 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Type			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	1					
				?	1							

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 190C 0101

VIOLIN

6

YOSHIOKA, AIRI

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

Page 1066 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

Ouestions				MD	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	S 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Quescion																
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00
		tor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1522		4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00
		ations reflect		-	0	4	0	0	0	2	0		1009/1476		4.70	4.22	4.09	4.00
	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained					5	0	0	0	0	1		****/1412		4.38	4.06	4.01	****
		_		ined	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	700/1500		4.39	4.18	4.16	4.33
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	3	3		1080/1517		4.61	4.65	4.62	4.50
9. How wor	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes					0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	5.00
Lecture																		
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s 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	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n 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 led	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					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 cla	ass discu			what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	3.92	****
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1277		4.54	4.34	4.13	****
		_	_	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	***
		Self	Dagad															
1 Did gol	lf_paged			what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.64	4.63	4.53	5.00
	_	cts with the i		_	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 33		4.55	4.69	4.57	5.00
_		k/tutoring by		-	4	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 22		4.00	4.54	4.31	****
			-	-														
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Re	anir	ed f	or Ma	iors	. – – –	1	 Graduat	e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0		110	7422	-	01 110	. ,		_	OI dada				,_	Ü
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				4	Under-9	rad	6	Non-	-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									_				3	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0						El	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
	I O					Ot]	her					0	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 190D 0101 University of Maryland
Title VIOLA Baltimore County
Instructor: BUSCHEK, KIMBER Spring 2007

С

D

F

Р

I

?

0

0

0

0

Enrollment:

56-83

84-150

Grad.

0

0

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

0

Questionnaires: 1

1

University of Maryland Page 1067
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

0

0

Under-grad

1

responses to be significant

- Means there are not enough

Non-major 1

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

						Frequencies						Inst	tructor	Cours	Course Dept		Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	.1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/152	2 5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00
2. Did	the instru	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/152	2 5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/147	6 5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00
8. How 1	many times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1389/151	7 4.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.00
9. How	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/149	7 5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	5.00
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared				0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/144	0 5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/144	8 5.00	4.89	4.71	4.63	5.00
		Self	Paced															
1. Did :	self-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 3	7 5.00	4.64	4.63	4.53	5.00
2. Did	study ques	tions make clea	r the	expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 2	3 5.00	4.00	4.41	4.19	5.00
3. Were	your cont	acts with the i	nstruc	tor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 3	3 4.00	4.55	4.69	4.57	4.00
4. Was	the feedba	ck/tutoring by	procto	rs helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 2	2 5.00	4.00	4.54	4.31	5.00
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
	_																	
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	3			Γ	уре 			Majors	;	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Gradua	te	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														

General

Other

Electives

Course-Section:	MUSC 190E 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1068
Title	CELLO	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	COX, FRANKLIN	Spring 2007	Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title	CELLO	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 20
Instructor:	COX, FRANKLIN	Spring 2007	Job IRBR30
Enrollment:	2		

Questionnaires: 1

	F:			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	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

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190I 0101 University of Maryland Page 1069 Title FLUTE Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007

(Instr. A) Spring 2007

Inst	ructo	or.	СЕППА,	LISA	(Instr.	A)
_	7 7		_			

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

	Fre						Frequencies				Course Dept		UMBC Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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			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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 190I 0101 University of Maryland Page 1070 Title JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

FLUTE Baltimore County Instructor: KESNER, LORI (Instr. B) Spring 2007

Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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
E		- D44												

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190K 0101 University of Maryland Page 1071
Title CLARINET Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

	,			- <u>-</u>		
Enrollment:	3					
Questionnaires:	3	Student	Course	Eval	luation	Questionnaire

	Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190Q 0101 University of Maryland SAXOPHONE Baltimore County Spring 2007 BEIZER, MATTHE Instructor:

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

Page 1072 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	uencies Instructor			Course Dep		pt UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	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

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190S 0101 University of Maryland Page 1073 Title PERCUSSION Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2007 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THO (Instr. A)

1110 OI GOOOI	001111111	(DETTIS 200.
Enrollment:	8		
Questionnaires:	2		Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	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

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190S 0101 University of Maryland Page 1074 PERCUSSION Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007

Title DAVE, BARRY Spring 2007 Instructor: (Instr. B) Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	8	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies					Instructor			Dept	UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.57	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0101 University of Maryland Page 1075
Title RECITAL PREPARATION Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA J Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	58				
Questionnaires:	23	Student Co	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions								_	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did v	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	1	0	1	0	4	6	11	4.18	970/1522	4.06	4.73	4.30	4.14	4.18
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	1	1	4	5	11		1032/1522		4.72	4.26	4.18	4.09
		uestions reflec			2	16	0	0	0	2	3		****/1285		4.78	4.30	4.22	****
	_	uations reflect		_	1	13	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	827/1476	4.36	4.70	4.22	4.09	4.22
				what you learned	0	20	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1412	3.80	4.38	4.06	4.01	****
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	20	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1381	4.20	4.48	4.08	3.93	***
7. Was t	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	6	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	149/1500	4.32	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.82
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	1	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	487/1517	4.91	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.91
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	11	3	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1133/1497	4.25	4.50	4.11	4.02	3.78
		Lectur	_															
1 Were	the instr	uctor's lecture		orenared	12	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	336/1440	4.82	4.68	4.45	4.40	4.82
					12	0	0	0	0			4.91			4.89	4.71	4.63	4.91
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	1		4.90	123/1436		4.68	4.29		4.90
	. Was recture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	0	1	0	2		4.44	707/1432		4.69			4.44
				our understanding	13 14	1	2	0	0	1		3.88	714/1221		4.44		3.86	
		1																
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	3						4.10	3.92	4.47
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0		14	4.82	299/1277		4.54	4.34	4.13	4.82
				d open discussion	6	0	0		0	3		4.82	310/1269		4.27	4.31		4.82
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful		7	5	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	153/ 854	4.64	4.37	4.02	3.87	4.64
				Frequ	ency	, Dist	trib	ution	n									
Q 11 b		G GD3		Down to d. Consider				D -									24	
Credits 1	Earnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons	3 			Ту	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 12		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	14
28-55																		
56-83						Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 2	13	Non-	major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0						Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ιh
P 2													respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0					Otl	her				1	.7							
? 0																		

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0301 University of Maryland Page 1076 Title RECITAL PREPARATION Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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

Credits Earned Cum		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	0	
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	n	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	10					
				?	0							

Course-Section	: MUSC 193A 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1077
Title	PIANO	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	FRANKLIN, RACH (Instr. A)	Spring 2007	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies				Instructor			Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	5.00

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

Course-Section	MUSC 193A 0101		University of Maryland	Page 1078
Title	PIANO		Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	HOLMES, JOEL	(Instr. C)	Spring 2007	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 2 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0101
Title VOICE

VOICE Baltimore County HUBBARD, JOYCE Spring 2007

Instructor: HUBBARD, JOYCE

Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 6

Page 1079 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Dep		ept UMBC Level		Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1522		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		****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 217	****	3.00	4.51	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 216	****	3.00	4.42	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	,	****	2.00	4.52	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	3.00	4.49	3.85	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1			****	3.00	4.45	3.88	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 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		,	****	3.00	4.40	3.99	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		****	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

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section:	MUSC 193C 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1080
Title	VIOLIN	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	YOSHTOKA, ATRI	Spring 2007	Job TRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 2

			Frequencies					Instr	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	0						

Questionnaires: 2

Course-Section	: MUSC 193D 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1081
Title	VIOLA	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	BUSCHEK, KIMBER	Spring 2007	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	3		

Student	Courge	Evra.	luation	Ouestion	naire

	Frequencies						Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. 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	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

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

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

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 110	aain na	Genera w insights,ski	_	m this source	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.14	5.00
		w insignes,ski tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.26	4.14	5.00
		estions reflec			0	5	0	0	0	0	1		****/1285	****	4.78	4.30	4.22	****
	_	ations reflect		_	٥	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00
				what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412		4.38	4.06	4.01	5.00
				o what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.48	4.08	3.93	5.00
		system clearl		-	0	4	0	0	0	1	1		483/1500		4.39	4.18	4.16	4.50
		was class canc		Illea	0	0	0	0	0	4	_		1217/1517		4.61	4.65	4.62	4.33
				hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3		189/1497		4.50	4.11		4.75
9. HOW WO	uia you g.	rade the overa	II teac.	ning effectiveness	۷	U	U	U	U	Т	3	4.75	109/149/	4.75	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.75
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well :	prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1440	****	4.68	4.45	4.40	****
2. Did th	e instruct	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1448	****	4.89	4.71	4.63	****
3. Was le	cture mate	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1436	****	4.68	4.29	4.24	****
4. Did th	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 au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1221	****	4.44	3.93	3.86	****
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	acc dicom			what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5 00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	3.92	****
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.13	****
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.04	****
		chniques succe		d Open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 854		4.37	4.02	3.87	****
4. Were s	peciai te	cilitques succe	SSIUI		3	U	U	U	U	U		5.00	/ 034		4.37	4.02	3.07	
		Self																
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	4.53	****
3. Were y	our contac	cts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	***	4.55	4.69	4.57	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ation	n									
	_																	
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	5 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	4
28-55																		
56-83						Gei	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	2
84-150																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0				Electives				0 #### -			+ - Means there are not enough							
Р 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt		
	P 0 I 0					Otl	her					5						
1 0 Other																		

1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Course-Section: MUSC 193K 0101

CLARINET

3

RICHARDS, MICHA

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

Page 1083 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	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		4.27	4.31	4.04	5.00

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 193Q 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1084
Title	SAXOPHONE	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	BELZER, MATTHE	Spring 2007	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies					Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	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	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193V 0101 Univer
Title ELECTRIC BASS Bal
Instructor: BALDWIN, THOMAS

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007 Page 1085 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quen	cies	3			uctor	Course			Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 1086 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

S	tudent	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---	--------	--------	------------	---------------

Course-Section: MUSC 194B 0101

VOICE

3

HUBBARD, JOYCE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	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			0	0	0	1	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.00
Tarkuna														
Lecture	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.40	5.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.89	4.45	4.40	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.68	4.71	4.03	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1430		4.69	4.29	4.24	5.00
4. Did the rectures contribute to what you rearned	Т	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.09	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			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.37	4.02	3.87	5.00
Frequ		D:	10 .											

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Course-Section: MUSC 194F 0101

2

ELECTRIC GUITAR

LAGANA, THOMAS

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

Page 1087 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

					-			Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect				
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om 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 th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.18	5.00
3. Did th	ie exam qi	uestions reflec	t the e	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 ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.09	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	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	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.39	4.18	4.16	4.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.50	4.11	4.02	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s 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	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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						0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.68	4.29	4.24	4.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	606/1221	4.00	4.44	3.93	3.86	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ıll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed 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 th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd 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 s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.37	4.02	3.87	4.00
F						/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$			
00-27	·								or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	Majo		1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 1 B 0		rec	quil	eu I	OT IAIG	JOL	5	U	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC) <u>T</u>	
26-33 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Cor	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non	-major	1
84-150					Gei	пета	1				U	onder-9	Lau	4	NOII-	ilia JUL	_	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0				0	#### - Means there			re not	- enous	rh			
JI au.	U	3.30-4.00	U	P 0		11.1	CCLI	v C D				J	respons				_	111
				I 0			her					0	T CBPOHS		,c 5191.	LLLCai		
		1 0			TTCT					U								

Course-Section: MUSC 211 0101 University of Maryland Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB IV Instructor: CELLA, LISA

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1088

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 17

St.udent.	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionna	ire
Doddon	004100		20000101110	

Questions							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions				NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om 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 t	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	89/1522	4.94	4.72	4.26	4.29	4.94
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflec	t 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 o	ther eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	1	5	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	172/1476	4.82	4.70	4.22	4.20	4.82
5. Did a	ssigned r	eadings contrib	ute 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 w	ritten as	signments contr	ibute	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 t	he grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	124/1500	4.88	4.39	4.18	4.20	4.88
8. How m	any times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.61	4.65	4.63	4.75
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	.11 tea	ching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	129/1497	4.85	4.50	4.11	4.11	4.85
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							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 1	ecture ma	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1436	****	4.68	4.29	4.29	****
4. Did t	he lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1432	****	4.69	4.29	4.31	****
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance :	your understanding	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1221	****	4.44	3.93	4.02	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	4.08	****
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.33	****
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.33	****
4. Were	 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion Were special techniques successful 				14	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	4.00	***
Fr						, Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Re:	asons	=			Ту	ne			Majors	3
Barned Cam. GFA Expected Grades									- 									
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 11					Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	15	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 0	B 5 C 0		_							1	, .	_			-
56-83	3		Ger	nerai	L				0	Under-a	rad 1	.7	Non-	maior	2.			

Credits E	arned	rned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	A 11 Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there		are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	14				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 214 0101

Title HIST JAZZ: ORIGINS-PRE

Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM

Enrollment: 67

Questionnaires: 25

67
s: 25
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2007

Page 1089 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	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	Λ	0	2	2	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		4.89	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		4.68	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		4.69	4.29	4.31	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	606/1221		4.44	3.93	4.02	
J. Dia addiovisual econniques enhance your understanding	5	2	_	O	1	O	,	1.00	000/1221	1.00	1.11	3.75	1.02	1.00
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		****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31		***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	А	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
					0						

Course-Section: MUSC 217 0101

ROCK & RELATED MUSIC

Title Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH

Enrollment: 104 Questionnaires: 51

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 1090 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	1	1	8	36	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		602/1285		4.78	4.30	4.36	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	33	1	0	1	3	7		****/1476	****	4.70	4.22	4.20	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	20	2	2	8	8	5		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		****/1381	****	4.48	4.08	3.97	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	2	9		4.72	- ,	4.72	4.39	4.18	4.20	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0 1	0	0	1 7	42	3		1375/1517	4.04	4.61	4.65	4.63	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	Τ	U	U	/	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		4.89	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			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	****
2. Note you provided with adequate bachground information	30	J	Ü	Ü	O	O	_	3.00	, 220		3.00	1.33	1.50	
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		****/ 65	****	3.00	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	49	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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	4.41	4.63	***
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		****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.75	****
1. 10 what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	/ 35		3.00	T.JL	T./3	
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	****	****

rreducticy practipacton	Frequency	Distribution
-------------------------	-----------	--------------

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

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 1 0

I

Course-Section: MUSC 219 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County INTRO DIGITAL AUDIO WK Spring 2007

Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1091

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0	HICCEIVED		responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	9	_			
				2	0						

MUSC 220 0101 University of Maryland INTRO TO PERCUSSION EN Baltimore County GOLDSTEIN, THOM Spring 2007

Baltimore County
Spring 2007

Page 1092 JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: MUSC 220 0101

1

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	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		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	Λ	Ω	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		4.37	4.02	4.00	4.00
	Ü	ŭ	3		,	-	Ü			_,,,,	,	02		00
Fire and		- D. J J		حماد ساء	_									

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

Course-Section: MUSC 226 0101 University of Maryland Title THEORY IV: MUSIC WRITIN

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1093

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 21 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ρ

I

0

0

RICHARDS, MICHA

Instructor:

							_	ncies		_		ructor	Course	_			Sect	
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	88/1522	4.95	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.95
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.72	4.26	4.29	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	t 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 ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	63/1476	4.95	4.70	4.22	4.20	4.95
5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute 1	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
		system clearly		ained	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	374/1500		4.39	4.18	4.20	4.62
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1517		4.61	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll tea	ching 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 ti	he instru	ctor's lecture.		prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.42	5.00
		tor seem inter		9	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1448		4.89	4.71	4.78	5.00	
			explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.29	5.00	
		s contribute to			9	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.31	5.00
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance :	your understanding	11	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	83/1221	4.88	4.44	3.93	4.02	4.88
1 541		Discus			1 -	^	_	^	^	0	4	4 60	206/1200	4 60	1 0 1	4 10	4 00	4 60
				what you learned	15 15	0	0	0	0	2 1	4 5	4.67 4.83	286/1280 290/1277		4.24	4.10	4.08	4.67 4.83
				ed to participate nd open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	5 6	5.00	1/1269		4.27		4.33	5.00
		chniques succes		nd open discussion	15	3	0	0	0	1	2		****/ 854		4.27	4.02	4.00	****
1. WEIC B	peciai ce	ciniiques succei	35141		13	3	O	O	O	_	2	1.07	, 031		1.57	1.02	1.00	
			Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ıtioı	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Pe:	asons	2			Тут	ne			Majors	•	
										, 								,
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 9														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	major	2
84-150												-			,			,
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0											1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh

Other

14

Course-Section: MUSC 230 0101 University of Maryla
Title MUSICS OF THE WORLD Baltimore County
Instructor: HUANG, YI-PING Spring 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 22

46

University of Maryland Page 1094
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fre	_	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did v	zou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	3	2	5	12	4.18	970/1522	4.18	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.18
_		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	8	2	12	4.18	945/1522		4.72	4.26	4.29	4.18
		uestions reflec			0	1	0	2	6	3	10	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.78	4.30	4.36	4.00
	_	uations reflect		_	1	1	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	735/1476		4.70	4.22	4.20	4.30
				what you learned	0	4	1	1	6	1	9	3.89	908/1412		4.38	4.06	4.00	3.89
				o what you learned	2	5	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	519/1381		4.48	4.08	3.97	4.33
		g system clearl			1	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	650/1500		4.39	4.18	4.20	4.38
		was class canc			2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	901/1517		4.61	4.65	4.63	4.70
	-			hing effectiveness	6	0	0	1	6	2	7	3.94	993/1497	3.94	4.50	4.11	4.11	3.94
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	1	1		16	4.62	669/1440		4.68	4.45	4.42	4.62
		ctor seem inter		-	1	0	0	0	0		20	4.95	247/1448		4.89	4.71	4.78	4.95
3. Was 1	Lecture ma	xplained clearly	2	0	0		2	4	13	4.45	672/1436	4.45	4.68	4.29	4.29	4.45		
4. Did t	the lectur	es contribute t	o 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 a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	156/1221	4.70	4.44	3.93	4.02	4.70
		Discus	gion															
1 Did o	rlace died			what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	566/1280	4.29	4 24	4.10	4.08	4.29
				d to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1277	4.86	4.54	4.34	4.33	4.86
				d open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	277/1269		4.27	4.31	4.33	4.86
		echniques succe		a open arseassion	15	1	0	0	1	0	-	4.67	141/ 854		4.37			4.67
1	Special o	coming bacce	00141			_	ŭ	Ü	_	Ü		1.07	111, 001	2.07	1.57	1.02	1.00	1.07
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	า									
Credits	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3		
00-27	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 13							ed fo	or Ma	aior		8	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	4
28-55										. ,		-		-	-) ~		=
56-83	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 3 C 0						nera:	1				4	Under-q	rad 2	22	Non-	major	18
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	_i h
	P 0												respons				_	•
				I O		Ot1	her					6	_		3			
? 1																		

University of Maryland CHAMBERS PLAYERS Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA Enrollment: 23 Ouestionnaires: 18

Title

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful

Page 1095 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 33 **** 4.55 4.69 4.75 ****

			_					- .		~			- 1	
			Fre	-	ncies				ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		4.24	4.10	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	4		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		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	Ω	Ο	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	5.00	****
1. Did Bell paced Byseem contribute to what you reallied	- '	-	-	-	-	-						1.05	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

17 0 0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99			General	6	Under-grad	18	Non-major	6	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0	General					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9	-		-	
				2	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

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		4.72	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 77	0	0	^	0	_	_	F 00	1 /1 4 4 0	г оо	4 60	4 4 5	1 10	F 00
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	6	5.00	1/1436		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	U	0	U	2	5.00	****/1221	***	4.44	3.93	3.94	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	4.14	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	1	0	0	0	3		****/1277	****	4.54	4.34	4.38	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	1	0	0	0	3		****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19 19	1	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 854	****	4.37	4.02	4.00	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	A 22 Required for Ma B 0		1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	23	Non-major	12
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 304 0101

UMBC JUBILEE SINGERS

Title JACKSON, JANICE

Instructor:

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 25

Baltimore County Spring 2007

University of Maryland

Page 1097 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		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 6	0 2	0	0	0	8 4	16	4.67	932/1517	4.67	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	ь	2	U	U	U	4	13	4./6	181/1497	4./6	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		****/1221	****		3.93	3.94	****
1									,					
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	****
- 1														
Laboratory	0.4	0	0	0	^	0	1	F 00	**** / 000	****	2 00	4 25	4 00	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 228	****	3.00	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24 24	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 217	****	3.00	4.51	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	U	U	U	U	U	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		****/ 47	****	3.00	4.41	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	3.00	4.30	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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		****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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		****/ 18	****	3.67	4.49	****	****
3. Here energy proceeds for all the students	21	U	U	U	J	U	_	5.00	, 10		3.07	1.19		

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	19	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 307A 0101 University of Maryland
Title JAZZ IMPROV Baltimore County
Instructor: LAGANA, TOM Spring 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

2

Page 1098 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

					ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

Credits E	arned	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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section	: MUSC 307D 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1099
Title	FLUTE	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	CETTA T.TCA	Spring 2007	Tob TDBD3020

Title FLUTE Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: CELLA, LISA Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 3

(Duestionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
,	Sacacionnaire ca.		beadene	COULDC	E varaacron	Questroimatr

			Fre	quer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	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	i
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section:	MUSC 307F 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1100
Title	PERCUSSION	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	GOLDSTEIN, THOM	Spring 2007	Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Τi In Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 4

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0

				Fre	equei	quencies			Insti	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

3 5.00

1/1497 5.00 4.50 4.11 4.13 5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307G 0101 University of Maryland Page 1101
Title COLLEGIUM Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 5

O +	a	The second second	Ouestionnaire
Student	COURSE	www.unarion	Ullestionnaire

Questionnaires: 4

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	Λ	Λ	Λ	Λ	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		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.37	4.02	4.00	5.00
-		. Dies	1											
Frequ	ency	Dist	rıbı	ıtıoı	1									

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 307K 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1102
Title	VOCAL ARTS ENSEMBLE	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	SMITH, DAVID A	Spring 2007	Job IRBR3029

SMITH, DAVID A Spring 2007 Enrollment:

Duestionnaires:	5	Student Course	Fwaluation	Ouestionnaire
Juesci Oilliailes.	5	Student Course	Evaluation	Oues Libiniair (

			Frequencies						ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	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

Credits Earned Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-	-		
				2	0						

Course-Section	n: MUSC 307L 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1103
Title	COLLABORATIVE PIANO	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	FRANKLIN, RACHE	Spring 2007	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	3		

Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequenc		ncie			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	UMBC Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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

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

Course-Section: MUSC 308 0101 University of Maryl Title UMBC WIND ENSEMBLE Baltimore County Instructor: VILLANEUVA, JAR Spring 2007

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

23

University of Maryland Page 1104
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	ı Quest:	ionnaire
---------	--------	------------	----------	----------

			Frequencies		5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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		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	****

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

Course-Section: MUSC 309 0101 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title UMBC NEW MUSIC ENSEMBL Instructor: SMITH, STUART S

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 11

4. Were special techniques successful

JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

8 1 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 854 **** 4.37 4.02 4.00 ****

Page 1105

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	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		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

Credits Earned Cum. GPA				Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	1	Other	6	_			
				2	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 Cou	rse Evaluatior	Questionnaire
-------------	----------------	---------------

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 313 0101

13

ADVANCED GAMELAN

BECK, GINA C

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

Spring 2007

Page 1107 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fre	_	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	1	0	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	1234/1522	3.88	4.73	4.30	4.34	3.88
		ctor make clear			1	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	874/1522		4.72	4.26	4.25	4.25
		uestions reflec			1	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	531/1285		4.78	4.30	4.30	4.50
	_	uations reflect		_	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	703/1476		4.70	4.22	4.26	4.33
				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 wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	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 th	he gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	2	2	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	988/1500	4.00	4.39	4.18	4.13	4.00
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	555/1517	4.88	4.61	4.65	4.62	4.88
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.50	4.11	4.13	4.00
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.68	4.45	4.46	5.00
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1448		4.89	4.71	4.71	5.00
				explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	295/1436	4.75	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.75
		es contribute t			6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.29	5.00
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	6	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	832/1221	3.67	4.44	3.93	3.94	3.67
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	4.14	****
				ed to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1277		4.54	4.34	4.38	****
				nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	1		721/1269		4.27	4.31	4.39	4.33
		echniques succe		•	5	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	141/ 854	4.67	4.37	4.02	4.00	4.67
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	2			Ту	ne			Majors	
			· 							, 								, . – – – –
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors		1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0				_				_	_		_			_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	T				2	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0								_	respons	es to k	oe sign	ıficar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					2						

Course-Section: MUSC 319 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV TOPICS IN MUSIC TE Baltimore County Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL Spring 2007

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 1108

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	9		
Questionnaires:	4	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	nnaire

							Fr	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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 th	e instru	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.75	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.30	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.70	4.22	4.26	5.00
				what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.03	5.00
				o 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 th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.39	4.18	4.13	5.00
8. How ma:	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.61	4.65	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1346/1497	3.33	4.50	4.11	4.13	3.33
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	3.94	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.37	4.02	4.00	5.00
				Frequ	.ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2					or Ma			0	Graduat		0	 Majo		4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 2 B 1		кес	quir	eu I	או דר	i JOES	5	U	Graduati	E	U	Majo	JΤ	4
28-55 56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Cos	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad.	4	Mo∽	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		Gei	пета	Т				U	under-g.	Lau	7	NOI1-	-major	U
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	1	F 0		TO 7	ecti [.]					0	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -			.h
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	T	P 0		E16	=CLI	ves				U					_	111
				P 0		∩ ⊢1	h 0 30					3	respons	es lo D	e sign	ıııcar	IL	
				? 0		Utl	her					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

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		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	1	9	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														
	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4 00	****/1280	****	4.24	4.10	4.14	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1277	****	4.54	4.10	4.14	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/1269	****	4.27	4.31	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 854		4.37	4.02	4.00	****
1. Note Special econityaes Successful		_	5	0	5		U	1.00	, 051		1.57	1.02	1.00	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d 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	В	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	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	16	-		-	
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 323 0101

Title CAREEER DEV FOR MUSICI

Instructor: CELLA, LISA

Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 12

Spring 2007
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1110 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
~ 														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	433/1522		4.73	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		4.72	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2		****/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		4.70	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		4.68	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		4.69	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		3.94	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		157/ 854		4.37	4.02		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	***
0.16 70 1														
Self Paced		0	0	_	0	0	-	F 00		als als als als	1 (1	4 60	F 00	ate ate ate ate
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 37	****	4.64	4.63	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 23	****	4.00	4.41	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 33	****	4.55	4.69	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	****	****
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									

Credits E	arned	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	В	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

Course-Section: MUSC 385 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE CONDUCTIN

0

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1111

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4	
Questionnaires:	4	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

MCCOY, MARK

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect						
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.73	4.30	4.34	4.75
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	255/1522	4.75	4.72	4.26	4.25	4.75
		estions reflect		_	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.30	5.00
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1476	4.75	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.75
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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
1 77 4	la a describero	Lecture			1	0	0	0	0	1	_	4 67	604/1440	4 67	4 60	4 45	1 10	4 60
		actor's lectures ctor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	604/1440	4.67	4.68	4.45 4.71	4.46	4.67
				n the subject xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0 1	3	5.00	1/1448 415/1436	5.00	4.89 4.68	4.71	4.71	5.00
		eriai presented es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	1		4.67 4.67	415/1436	4.67 4.67	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.67 4.67
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1221		4.44			5.00
5. Did au	.arovisuai	r recumiques em	nance y	our understanding	T	U	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.44	3.93	3.94	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	d 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 th	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair an	d 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 s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.37	4.02	4.00	5.00
				_														
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribi	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	aiors	3	0	Graduate		0	Majo	r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2			1			,						5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad	4	Non-	-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									5				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means th			here a	here are not enough									
				P 0					_									
				I 0		Otl	ner					2	_					

Course-Section	: MUSC 390B 0101		University of Maryland	Page 1112
Title	VOICE		Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	HUBBARD, JOYCE	(Instr. A)	Spring 2007	Job IRBR3029

Instructor:

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA		-	ncies	5 4	5	Ins Mean		Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level 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

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 390B 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1113
Title	VOICE	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007

Spring 2007 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID (Instr. B) Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	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

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

	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1522	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
 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
 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

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 390X 0101		University of Maryland	Page 1115
Title	SENIOR PROJECT		Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	COX, FRANKLIN	(Instr. A)	Spring 2007	Job IRBR3029

COULDE DECELOII	. 11000 33011 0101		oniversity of maryiana	rage
Title	SENIOR PROJECT		Baltimore County	JUN 26,
Instructor:	COX, FRANKLIN	(Instr. A)	Spring 2007	Job IRB
Enrollment:	5			

Questionnaires: 2

			Fre	eque:	ncies	S		Insti	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General 1. Did vou 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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 390X 0101		University of Maryland	Page 1116
Title	SENIOR PROJECT		Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	SMITH, DAVID	(Instr. B)	Spring 2007	Job IRBR3029

Spring 2007 Instructor: SMITH, DAVID (Instr. B) Enrollment: 5

Questionnaires: 2

	Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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 1 5.00 1/1497 5.00 4.50 4.11 4.13 5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 400 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1117
Title	SPECIAL PROJECTS	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:	KIMBOYLE, DAVID	Spring 2007	Job IRBR3029

		,
Enrollment:	8	
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	5	Non-major	1
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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 1118 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4			
Questionnaires:	2	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0201

SPECIAL PROJECTS

WANNEBERGER, A

Title

Instructor:

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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		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		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		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.37	4.02	4.31	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 401 0101 University of Maryland Page 1119
Title SPECIAL PROJECTS: COMP Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA (Instr. A) Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: DUSMAN, LINDA (Instr. A)
Enrollment: 2

Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies						Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	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

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 401 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1120
Title	SPECIAL PROJECTS: COMP	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 2007
	C117 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	G 1 000F	T 1 TDDD 2000

Instructor: SMITH, STUART (Instr. B) Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	2				
Questionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Instr	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	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

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

Course-Section: MUSC 41	8 0101	University of Maryland	Page 11
Title MUSIC T	ECH. INTERNSHIP	Baltimore County	JUN 26, 20
To a	D DATED	0.007	T-1- TDDD 2.0

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 1

6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned

9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0

8. How many times was class cancelled

1121 2007 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies				Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	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

0

0 0 0

0 0 0

0 0 1

0 1 5.00

5.00

1 5.00

1/1381 5.00 4.48

4.08 4.21

1/1517 5.00 4.61 4.65 4.71 5.00

1/1497 5.00 4.50 4.11 4.21 5.00

5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

0

0

0 0 0

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

Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 428 0101

4

ELECTRONIC MUSIC

RUBIN, ANNA I.

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Page 1122 JUN 26, 2007 Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quarkiana					Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.73	4.30	4.42	5.00
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.72	4.26	4.34	4.50
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.78	4.30	4.42	4.50
	_	ations reflect		_	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.70	4.22	4.31	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		339/1412	4.50	4.38	4.06	4.11	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0		806/1381	4.00	4.48	4.08	4.21	4.00
		g system clearl			0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1298/1500	3.50	4.39	4.18	4.25	3.50
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.61	4.65	4.71	4.00
	-			ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	898/1497	4.00	4.50	4.11	4.21	4.00
		Lectur	_															
1 Were t	he instr	actor's lecture		arenared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.68	4.45	4.52	4.50
		ctor seem inter		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1448	5.00	4.89	4.71	4.75	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50		4.50	4.68	4.29	4.32	4.50
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1432		4.69	4.29		5.00
				our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1132			3.93		5.00
J. Dia aa	alovibaai	r ccciniiques en	ilalice y	Jar understanding	Ü	O	O	O	U	Ü	2	3.00	1/1221	3.00	1.11	3.75	1.01	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d 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 s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.37	4.02	4.31	4.00
				Frequ	ency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		_						_			_			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					1						
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 480 0101 University of Maryl Title TOPICS IN MUSC/ART/SOC Baltimore County Instructor: TANOSAKI, KAZUK Spring 2007

Enrollment:

Grad.

1

3.50-4.00

2

Ρ

I

?

0

0

Questionnaires: 6

7

University of Maryland Page 1123
Baltimore County JUN 26, 2007
Spring 2007 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

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

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	•	•	0	-	_	4 00	005/1500	4 00	4 50	4 20	4 40	4 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0		5	4.83	225/1522		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		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	Ţ	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	•	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	Ţ	3 4	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	-	4.67	312/1500		4.39	4.18	4.25	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3 2	3		1080/1517	4.50	4.61	4.65	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	U	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	Λ	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	4.73	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
5. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding	3	U	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	1/1221	3.00	4.44	3.93	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	Λ	2	Λ	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		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		4.37			4.00
1. Were appearant economy des successivat	3	-	Ü	Ü	_	O	_	1.00	120/ 031	1.00	1.57	1.02	1.51	1.00
Frequ	iencv	7 Dist	rib	ıt.i.oı	า									
					· -									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades		Reasons					Ty	уре		Majors				
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	e	1	Majo	r	2
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2														
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	4
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0														

Electives

Other

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

G . 1 .	~			
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionr	ıaıre

		Frequencies						Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	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

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