

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0101
 Title: FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
 Instructor: GENDELMAN, MART
 Enrollment: 74
 Questionnaires: 74

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1137
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	32	0	1	3	8	16	14	3.93	1254/1649	4.34	4.62	4.28	4.11	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	32	0	1	1	7	11	22	4.24	920/1648	4.26	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	32	0	0	2	3	6	31	4.57	488/1375	4.47	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	32	3	1	2	5	20	11	3.97	1107/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.03	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	32	7	3	4	7	11	10	3.60	1180/1533	3.96	4.34	4.04	3.87	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	32	3	7	6	9	13	4	3.03	1425/1512	3.41	4.32	4.10	3.86	3.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	32	1	1	4	5	13	18	4.05	1009/1623	3.92	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	32	0	1	0	0	1	40	4.88	697/1646	4.34	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	39	0	0	3	12	17	3	3.57	1314/1621	4.10	4.43	4.06	3.96	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	34	0	1	3	6	21	9	3.85	1366/1568	3.83	4.59	4.43	4.39	3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	0	1	3	7	30	4.61	1146/1572	4.67	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	35	0	0	5	10	18	6	3.64	1344/1564	3.35	4.53	4.28	4.20	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	2	3	7	14	14	3.88	1211/1559	3.84	4.57	4.29	4.20	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	3	3	3	12	13	7	3.47	1064/1352	3.63	4.41	3.98	3.86	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	65	0	1	2	4	0	2	3.00	****/1384	3.47	4.37	4.08	3.86	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	65	0	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	****/1382	4.00	4.65	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	65	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	****/1368	4.07	4.55	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were special techniques successful	65	1	1	2	1	2	2	3.25	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	5.00	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	0	0	0	3	1	13	4.59	****/ 555	4.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	0	0	2	1	9	0	3.58	****/ 288	3.43	3.78	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	2	1	1	10	1	3.47	****/ 312	3.13	3.77	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.80	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.89	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.83	****

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0101
 Title FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
 Instructor: GENDELMAN, MART
 Enrollment: 74
 Questionnaires: 74

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1137
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors 22	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 5	General 13	Under-grad 74 Non-major 74
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0301
 Title FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
 Instructor: TANOSAKI, KAZUK
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1138
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	328/1649	4.34	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	13	9	4.29	850/1648	4.26	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	11	11	4.38	694/1375	4.47	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	566/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	565/1533	3.96	4.34	4.04	3.87	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	10	7	3.79	1095/1512	3.41	4.32	4.10	3.86	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	8	8	3.79	1246/1623	3.92	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	19	0	3.79	1617/1646	4.34	4.55	4.69	4.67	3.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	270/1621	4.10	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	6	4	5	3.81	1381/1568	3.83	4.59	4.43	4.39	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	967/1572	4.67	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	4	5	3	2	3.07	1491/1564	3.35	4.53	4.28	4.20	3.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	4	6	4	3.80	1246/1559	3.84	4.57	4.29	4.20	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	6	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	900/1352	3.63	4.41	3.98	3.86	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	4	4	4	3.47	1097/1384	3.47	4.37	4.08	3.86	3.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.65	4.29	4.03	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	931/1368	4.07	4.55	4.30	4.01	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	5.00	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	2	0	5	0	3.43	199/ 288	3.43	3.78	3.68	3.54	3.43	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	4	0	3	1	3.13	255/ 312	3.13	3.77	3.68	3.51	3.13	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	4.80	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	4.89	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 101 0301
 Title FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR
 Instructor: TANOSAKI, KAZUK
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1138
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0101
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: TRIPPROBERSON, (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1139
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	4	7	6	0	3.12	1591/1649	4.37	4.62	4.28	4.11	3.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	5	7	3	2	3.12	1585/1648	4.37	4.58	4.23	4.16	3.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	2	6	5	2	3.18	1303/1375	4.33	4.62	4.27	4.10	3.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	2	1	5	6	3	0	2.73	1571/1595	4.04	4.53	4.20	4.03	2.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	9	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	1504/1533	2.57	4.34	4.04	3.87	2.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	11	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	4	6	3	1	2.93	1551/1623	3.64	4.32	4.16	4.08	2.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1521/1646	4.45	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	7	2	0	4	2.59	1579/1621	4.11	4.43	4.06	3.96	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	3	4	4	2	3.21	1499/1568	4.47	4.59	4.43	4.39	3.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	3	8	3	0	3.00	1556/1572	4.40	4.84	4.70	4.64	3.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	3	4	5	2	0	2.43	1550/1564	4.27	4.53	4.28	4.20	3.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	7	6	0	0	2.36	1537/1559	4.30	4.57	4.29	4.20	3.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	2	1	5	1	0	2.56	1297/1352	4.39	4.41	3.98	3.86	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	3	2	0	2.75	1322/1384	3.63	4.37	4.08	3.86	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	4	1	1	3.13	1306/1382	4.06	4.65	4.29	4.03	3.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	3	1	1	0	2.00	1356/1368	3.50	4.55	4.30	4.01	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0101
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1140
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	4	7	6	0	3.12	1591/1649	4.37	4.62	4.28	4.11	3.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	5	7	3	2	3.12	1585/1648	4.37	4.58	4.23	4.16	3.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	2	6	5	2	3.18	1303/1375	4.33	4.62	4.27	4.10	3.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	2	1	5	6	3	0	2.73	1571/1595	4.04	4.53	4.20	4.03	2.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	9	1	2	3	1	0	2.57	1504/1533	2.57	4.34	4.04	3.87	2.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	11	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	4	6	3	1	2.93	1551/1623	3.64	4.32	4.16	4.08	2.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1521/1646	4.45	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	305/1621	4.11	4.43	4.06	3.96	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	715/1568	4.47	4.59	4.43	4.39	3.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1333/1572	4.40	4.84	4.70	4.64	3.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	620/1564	4.27	4.53	4.28	4.20	3.48	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	749/1559	4.30	4.57	4.29	4.20	3.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	415/1352	4.39	4.41	3.98	3.86	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	3	2	0	2.75	1322/1384	3.63	4.37	4.08	3.86	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	2	4	1	1	3.13	1306/1382	4.06	4.65	4.29	4.03	3.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	3	1	1	0	2.00	1356/1368	3.50	4.55	4.30	4.01	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0201
 Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: TRIPPROBERSON, (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1141
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	4.37	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	4.37	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	4.33	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	4.04	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	2.57	4.34	4.04	3.87	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1029/1623	3.64	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.45	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621	4.11	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.47	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1241/1572	4.40	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1127/1564	4.27	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.30	4.57	4.29	4.20	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.63	4.37	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	4.06	4.65	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	3.50	4.55	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0201
 Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1142
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	4.37	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	4.37	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	4.33	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	4.04	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	2.57	4.34	4.04	3.87	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1029/1623	3.64	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.45	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621	4.11	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.47	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1241/1572	4.40	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	4.27	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.30	4.57	4.29	4.20	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	4.39	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.63	4.37	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	4.06	4.65	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	3.50	4.55	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0301
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: POLLAUFG, JACQUE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1143
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1649	4.37	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1648	4.37	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.33	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	636/1595	4.04	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	2.57	4.34	4.04	3.87	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1029/1623	3.64	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1646	4.45	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	374/1621	4.11	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	4.47	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	4.40	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	4.27	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.30	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	4.39	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	3.63	4.37	4.08	3.86	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	4.06	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	3.50	4.55	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0301
 Title: MUSICIANSHIP LAB I
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1144
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1649	4.37	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1648	4.37	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.33	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	636/1595	4.04	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	2.57	4.34	4.04	3.87	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1029/1623	3.64	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1646	4.45	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	374/1621	4.11	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	4.47	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	4.40	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.27	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.30	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	4.39	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	3.63	4.37	4.08	3.86	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	4.06	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	3.50	4.55	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0301
 Title Music Repertoire
 Instructor: Yoshioka, Airi
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 19
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	****	4.01	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0601
 Title: MUSIC REPERTOIRE
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1145
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	702/1648	4.40	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	405/1595	4.58	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	128/1533	4.86	4.34	4.04	3.87	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	564/1512	4.36	4.32	4.10	3.86	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	780/1623	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1440/1646	4.20	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	720/1621	4.22	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1568	****	4.59	4.43	4.39	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1572	****	4.84	4.70	4.64	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1564	****	4.53	4.28	4.20	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1559	****	4.57	4.29	4.20	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.86	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 125 0101
 Title THEORY I:BASICS OF MUS
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1146
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	274/1649	3.83	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	175/1648	3.65	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	133/1375	4.07	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	352/1595	3.86	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	2	1	2	5	4.00	815/1533	3.29	4.34	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	436/1512	3.68	4.32	4.10	3.86	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	469/1623	3.84	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	1230/1646	4.41	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	159/1621	3.38	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	636/1568	3.61	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	414/1572	3.65	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	135/1564	3.56	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	318/1559	3.55	4.57	4.29	4.20	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	399/1352	3.50	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	359/1384	3.41	4.37	4.08	3.86	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	676/1382	3.22	4.65	4.29	4.03	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	426/1368	3.48	4.55	4.30	4.01	4.75	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 16	Non-major 3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 11		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 125 0201
 Title THEORY I:BASICS OF MUS
 Instructor: TRIPPROBERSON,
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1147
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	6	5	2	1	2.86	1625/1649	3.83	4.62	4.28	4.11	2.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	2	5	6	1	0	2.43	1638/1648	3.65	4.58	4.23	4.16	2.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	4	5	3	2	3.21	1293/1375	4.07	4.62	4.27	4.10	3.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	2	1	4	1	3	2	3.09	1528/1595	3.86	4.53	4.20	4.03	3.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	1	5	4	2	0	2.58	1503/1533	3.29	4.34	4.04	3.87	2.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	5	0	3	5	0	1	2.89	1462/1512	3.68	4.32	4.10	3.86	2.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	4	5	4	1	3.14	1512/1623	3.84	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1325/1646	4.41	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	4	3	4	0	0	2.00	1610/1621	3.38	4.43	4.06	3.96	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	4	1	2	4	0	2.55	1553/1568	3.61	4.59	4.43	4.39	2.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	2	4	4	1	0	2.36	1570/1572	3.65	4.84	4.70	4.64	2.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	3	3	5	0	0	2.18	1555/1564	3.56	4.53	4.28	4.20	2.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	3	2	2	0	2.30	1540/1559	3.55	4.57	4.29	4.20	2.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1293/1352	3.50	4.41	3.98	3.86	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	4	1	0	0	2.20	1359/1384	3.41	4.37	4.08	3.86	2.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	3	1	0	0	2.00	1374/1382	3.22	4.65	4.29	4.03	2.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	3	0	1	0	2.20	1353/1368	3.48	4.55	4.30	4.01	2.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.54	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 170 0201
 Title BEGINNING VOICE CLASS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1148
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	830/1649	4.37	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	475/1648	4.58	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	209/1595	4.79	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	3	1	4	2	4	3.21	1381/1533	3.21	4.34	4.04	3.87	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1395/1512	3.20	4.32	4.10	3.86	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	3	2	5	5	2	3.06	1528/1623	3.06	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	428/1621	4.47	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	301/1568	4.87	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	250/1559	4.87	4.57	4.29	4.20	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	157/1352	4.75	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	165/1384	4.88	4.37	4.08	3.86	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	272/1382	4.88	4.65	4.29	4.03	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	910/1368	4.13	4.55	4.30	4.01	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	4.52	3.95	3.75	4.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.54	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.80	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.89	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 172A 0101
 Title DICTION
 Instructor: KING, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1149
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	3.87	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.32	4.10	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 173 0101
 Title INTRO TO CHORAL SINGIN
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1150
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1376/1649	3.75	4.62	4.28	4.11	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1347/1648	3.75	4.58	4.23	4.16	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1249/1533	3.50	4.34	4.04	3.87	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1266/1512	3.50	4.32	4.10	3.86	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1192/1621	3.75	4.43	4.06	3.96	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	939/1564	4.25	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1370/1559	3.50	4.57	4.29	4.20	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.33
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.54	4.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 312	4.50	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 174 0101
 Title: BEG VOCAL METHODS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1151
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1429/1649	3.67	4.62	4.28	4.11	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1546/1648	3.33	4.58	4.23	4.16	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1564	****	4.53	4.28	4.20	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	262/ 288	2.33	3.78	3.68	3.54	2.33	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 178A 0101
 Title: BEG KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1152
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1037/1649	4.59	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	148/1648	4.95	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.90	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	236/1595	4.88	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	3.87	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	358/1623	4.82	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	4.83	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	595/1621	4.29	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	4.90	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	318/1559	4.90	4.57	4.29	4.20	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	914/1352	3.88	4.41	3.98	3.86	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.80	4.43	4.27	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 5
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 11

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 178A 0201
 Title: BEG KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1153
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1649	4.59	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1648	4.95	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375	4.90	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1595	4.88	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1623	4.82	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1037/1646	4.83	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	687/1621	4.29	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	4.90	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.90	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	690/1352	3.88	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 179A 0101
 Title INTER KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1154
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	871/1649	4.55	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	464/1648	4.75	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	665/1375	4.70	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	440/1595	4.69	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	680/1533	4.20	4.34	4.04	3.87	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	358/1623	4.78	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	597/1646	4.96	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	812/1621	4.25	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1568	****	4.59	4.43	4.39	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1572	****	4.84	4.70	4.64	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1564	****	4.53	4.28	4.20	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1559	****	4.57	4.29	4.20	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.06	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 179A 0201
 Title INTER KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1155
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	317/1649	4.55	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	118/1648	4.75	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1375	4.70	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	7	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	174/1595	4.69	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1533	4.20	4.34	4.04	3.87	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	109/1623	4.78	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1646	4.96	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	559/1621	4.25	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1568	****	4.59	4.43	4.39	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1572	****	4.84	4.70	4.64	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1564	****	4.53	4.28	4.20	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/1559	****	4.57	4.29	4.20	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	5.00	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	64/ 312	4.06	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.13	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.80	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.89	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 179A 0201
 Title INTER KEYBOARD SKILLS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1155
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0101
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1156
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	3	4	2	7	3.81	1343/1649	4.06	4.62	4.28	4.11	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	1043/1648	4.16	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	496/1375	4.51	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	660/1595	4.38	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	8	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	815/1533	4.05	4.34	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1512	4.14	4.32	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	1	6	5	2	3.25	1485/1623	3.41	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	714/1646	4.94	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	1045/1621	3.89	4.43	4.06	3.96	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	815/1568	4.45	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	690/1572	4.72	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	929/1564	4.31	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	0	11	4.40	832/1559	4.45	4.57	4.29	4.20	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	263/1352	4.45	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1240/1384	3.06	4.37	4.08	3.86	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	831/1382	4.13	4.65	4.29	4.03	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1279/1368	3.28	4.55	4.30	4.01	3.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	238/ 555	4.80	4.80	4.29	4.14	4.80	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 312	3.33	3.77	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	33/ 53	4.16	4.78	4.30	4.17	4.18	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	5	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	33/ 41	3.98	4.80	4.43	4.27	3.80	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	4	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	16/ 24	4.33	4.89	4.42	4.24	4.33	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	5	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 110	3.80	4.60	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0201
 Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS
 Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1157
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	5	1	10	4.31	898/1649	4.06	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	977/1648	4.16	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	593/1375	4.51	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	660/1595	4.38	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	5	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	754/1533	4.05	4.34	4.04	3.87	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	799/1512	4.14	4.32	4.10	3.86	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	4	2	6	3.56	1363/1623	3.41	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.94	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	5	6	3	3.86	1105/1621	3.89	4.43	4.06	3.96	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	3	0	10	4.36	1031/1568	4.45	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1174/1572	4.72	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	833/1564	4.31	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	695/1559	4.45	4.57	4.29	4.20	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	457/1352	4.45	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	5	0	1	3.00	1254/1384	3.06	4.37	4.08	3.86	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	946/1382	4.13	4.65	4.29	4.03	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	1201/1368	3.28	4.55	4.30	4.01	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	4.80	4.80	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	2	0	4	0	3.33	239/ 312	3.33	3.77	3.68	3.51	3.33	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	34/ 53	4.16	4.78	4.30	4.17	4.14	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	1	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	29/ 41	3.98	4.80	4.43	4.27	4.17	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 24	4.33	4.89	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	4	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	86/ 110	3.80	4.60	3.99	3.83	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	Major 0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Non-major 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 7
				P 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 0

Course-Section: MUSC 182 0101
 Title BEGINNING STRING CLASS
 Instructor: TREMBLAY, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1158
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	119/1595	4.92	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.34	4.04	3.87	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.32	4.10	3.86	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1513/1646	4.08	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	511/1621	4.40	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.37	4.08	3.86	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0 Graduate
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0 Under-grad 14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 188 0101
 Title PERCUSSION CLASS
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1159
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	683/1649	4.47	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	154/1648	4.89	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	106/1595	4.92	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	421/1533	4.45	4.34	4.04	3.87	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	3.86	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	416/1623	4.59	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	398/1646	4.95	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	676/1621	4.27	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	234/1564	4.83	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	1016/1559	4.18	4.57	4.29	4.20	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	107/1352	4.89	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1122/1384	3.40	4.37	4.08	3.86	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	796/1368	4.33	4.55	4.30	4.01	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	365/ 948	4.20	4.52	3.95	3.75	4.20	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	20	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 189 0101
 Title GUITAR CLASS
 Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1160
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	736/1649	4.44	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	336/1648	4.69	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	6	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	133/1595	4.90	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	7	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.34	4.04	3.87	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1258/1646	4.44	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	372/1568	4.82	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	591/1572	4.91	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1564	4.91	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.37	4.08	3.86	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.65	4.29	4.03	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.55	4.30	4.01	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	5.00	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	60/ 312	4.17	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.17	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.80	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.89	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 189 0101
 Title GUITAR CLASS
 Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1160
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	20	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1161
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	4.93	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	4.93	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	4.75	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	3.86	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.01	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	3.75	5.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1162
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	230/1649	4.93	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	182/1648	4.93	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.34	4.04	3.87	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	3.86	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	883/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1130/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	374/1621	4.75	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.17	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.80	4.43	4.27	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0401
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: MARKOVICPRAKASH
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1163
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.17	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.80	4.43	4.27	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.89	4.42	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190C 0101
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1164
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1037/1646	4.83	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.17	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.80	4.43	4.27	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.89	4.42	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190C 0201
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: TREMBLAY, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1165
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	4.83	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190D 0101
 Title VIOLA
 Instructor: LAMBROS, MARIA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1166
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	3.87	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190I 0201
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: KESNER, LORI
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1167
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	274/1649	4.80	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.62	4.27	4.10	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	3.87	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1623	****	4.32	4.16	4.08	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1621	4.60	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.60
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190J 0101
 Title OBOE
 Instructor: LANDE, VLADIMIR
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1168
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.01	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	522/ 555	2.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	2.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 190Q 0201
 Title SAXOPHONE
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1169
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	3.87	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	3.75	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	220/ 243	3.00	2.67	4.12	4.08	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190S 0201
 Title PERCUSSION
 Instructor: DOVE, BARRY
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1170
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	3.87	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.01	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.54	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.17	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1171
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	3.75	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0301
 Title RECITAL PREPARATION
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1172
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	9	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	3.87	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	156/1512	4.80	4.32	4.10	3.86	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1621	4.83	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1169/1568	4.20	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1419/1572	4.20	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1001/1564	4.20	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1559	****	4.57	4.29	4.20	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.86	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1173
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	3.87	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	3.86	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.25	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	3.75	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 221	5.00	5.00	4.16	4.05	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	2.67	4.12	4.08	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	3.00	4.06	3.72	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.09	3.65	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.36	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.37	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.17	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.16	4.06	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.80	4.43	4.27	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.89	4.42	4.24	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 110	5.00	4.60	3.99	3.83	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 193A 0201
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1174
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1029/1623	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.25	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0101
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: KING, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1175
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	4.50	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1328/1375	3.00	4.62	4.27	4.10	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	4.67	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1441/1533	4.33	4.34	4.04	3.87	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1505/1512	2.00	4.32	4.10	3.86	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.67	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	266/ 288	2.00	3.78	3.68	3.54	2.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.17	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.80	4.43	4.27	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0301
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1176
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	4.67	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	4.33	4.34	4.04	3.87	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1387/1623	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.67	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	308/ 312	3.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0401
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: MARKOVICPRAKASH
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1177
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1183/1649	4.50	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.67	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	4.33	4.34	4.04	3.87	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	4.67	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 312	3.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193C 0101
 Title VIOLIN
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1178
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.54	4.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	291/ 312	2.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193F 0101
 Title GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1179
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.34	4.04	3.87	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	310/1512	4.60	4.32	4.10	3.86	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1462/1646	4.17	4.55	4.69	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.86	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.03	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193G 0101
 Title CLASSICAL GUITAR
 Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1180
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1428/1512	3.00	4.32	4.10	3.86	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1515/1568	3.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1496/1564	3.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1479/1559	3.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193I 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1181
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	3.86	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	291/ 312	2.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	2.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.17	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.80	4.43	4.27	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193U 0101
 Title HARP
 Instructor: POLLAUF, JACQUE
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1182
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193V 0101
 Title ELECTRIC BASS
 Instructor: BALDWIN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1183
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	3.87	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	3.86	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193W 0201
 Title UPRIGHT BASS
 Instructor: RUAS, LAURA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1184
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	4.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	3.78	3.68	3.54	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194A 0101
 Title PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1185
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.50	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1186
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	4.50	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.17	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.80	4.43	4.27	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194F 0101
 Title GUITAR
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1187
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.34	4.04	3.87	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	3.86	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1426/1568	3.67	4.59	4.43	4.39	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	512/1559	4.67	4.57	4.29	4.20	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	3.86	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.55	4.30	4.01	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.52	3.95	3.75	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1188
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 194Y 0101
 Title IMPROV
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1189
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 210 0101
 Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB III
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1190
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1649	4.89	4.62	4.28	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	702/1648	4.63	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	166/1375	4.95	4.62	4.27	4.37	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	580/1595	4.68	4.53	4.20	4.22	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	4.04	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	6	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	687/1512	4.25	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	635/1623	4.55	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1103/1646	4.73	4.55	4.69	4.63	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	483/1621	4.56	4.43	4.06	4.01	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.88	4.84	4.70	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	939/1564	4.25	4.53	4.28	4.27	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1370/1559	3.50	4.57	4.29	4.33	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.21	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	3.80	3.78	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	217/ 312	3.75	3.77	3.68	3.59	3.50	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 210 0201
 Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB III
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1191
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	295/1649	4.89	4.62	4.28	4.29	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	182/1648	4.63	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1375	4.95	4.62	4.27	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	133/1595	4.68	4.53	4.20	4.22	4.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	8	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	4.04	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1512	4.25	4.32	4.10	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	284/1623	4.55	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	748/1646	4.73	4.55	4.69	4.63	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	207/1621	4.56	4.43	4.06	4.01	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1568	4.50	4.59	4.43	4.39	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	4.88	4.84	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1564	4.25	4.53	4.28	4.27	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1559	3.50	4.57	4.29	4.33	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 221	****	5.00	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	167/ 288	3.80	3.78	3.68	3.65	3.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	68/ 312	3.75	3.77	3.68	3.59	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.80	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.89	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 210 0201
 Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB III
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1191
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 217 0101
 Title ROCK & RELATED MUSIC
 Instructor: VOLAJ, ALTIN
 Enrollment: 189
 Questionnaires: 135

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1192
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	25	0	0	7	14	43	46	4.16	1057/1649	4.16	4.62	4.28	4.29	4.16	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	22	0	1	7	13	26	66	4.32	825/1648	4.32	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	25	0	0	7	11	30	62	4.34	733/1375	4.34	4.62	4.27	4.37	4.34	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	25	54	1	1	14	13	27	4.14	956/1595	4.14	4.53	4.20	4.22	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	24	2	5	6	15	32	51	4.08	761/1533	4.08	4.34	4.04	4.04	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	24	75	2	1	12	5	16	3.89	1035/1512	3.89	4.32	4.10	4.14	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	24	0	1	5	20	27	58	4.23	849/1623	4.23	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	23	3	0	1	3	5	100	4.87	714/1646	4.87	4.55	4.69	4.63	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	41	4	1	2	29	40	18	3.80	1151/1621	3.80	4.43	4.06	4.01	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	29	0	0	2	11	30	63	4.45	917/1568	4.45	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	29	0	0	3	7	14	82	4.65	1084/1572	4.65	4.84	4.70	4.73	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	1	6	22	28	49	4.11	1073/1564	4.11	4.53	4.28	4.27	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	1	1	5	13	26	60	4.32	911/1559	4.32	4.57	4.29	4.33	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	28	3	2	4	9	18	71	4.46	341/1352	4.46	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	63	0	8	8	12	16	28	3.67	1011/1384	3.67	4.37	4.08	3.99	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	64	0	4	6	14	17	30	3.89	1038/1382	3.89	4.65	4.29	4.19	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	64	0	5	5	10	18	33	3.97	973/1368	3.97	4.55	4.30	4.21	3.97	
4. Were special techniques successful	62	46	5	1	6	4	11	3.56	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	125	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	5.00	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	129	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	127	4	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	127	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	100	7	2	2	5	0	19	4.14	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	125	7	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	127	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	126	5	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	127	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	108	6	2	5	2	10	2	3.24	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	127	0	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	128	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	127	4	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	127	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	99	6	1	6	0	21	2	3.57	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	127	0	2	0	2	0	4	3.50	****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	127	4	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	127	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 41	****	4.80	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	127	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.89	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	123	5	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 217 0101
 Title ROCK & RELATED MUSIC
 Instructor: VOLAJ, ALTIN
 Enrollment: 189
 Questionnaires: 135

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1192
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	22	0.00-0.99	4	A	69	Required for Majors	51	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	15	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	3	General	40	Under-grad	135	Non-major	135
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 218 0101
 Title RECORDING TECHNIQUES
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1193
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.62	4.28	4.29	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	370/1375	4.70	4.62	4.27	4.37	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.53	4.20	4.22	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.34	4.04	4.04	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	627/1512	4.30	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	635/1623	4.40	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1148/1646	4.56	4.55	4.69	4.63	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	288/1621	4.60	4.43	4.06	4.01	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.84	4.70	4.73	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	550/1564	4.60	4.53	4.28	4.27	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.57	4.29	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	188/1352	4.70	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.33	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 221 0101
 Title JAZZ THRY AND AURAL SK
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1194
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	182/1648	4.86	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1375	4.86	4.62	4.27	4.37	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	162/1595	4.86	4.53	4.20	4.22	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	128/1533	4.86	4.34	4.04	4.04	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	133/1512	4.86	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	145/1623	4.86	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1268/1646	4.43	4.55	4.69	4.63	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.01	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	234/1564	4.83	4.53	4.28	4.27	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	394/1384	4.57	4.37	4.08	3.99	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1382	4.71	4.65	4.29	4.19	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1368	4.86	4.55	4.30	4.21	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.33	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 224 0101
 Title INSTRUMENTATION
 Instructor: MACAULAY, JANIC
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1195
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	306/1649	4.78	4.62	4.28	4.29	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	498/1648	4.56	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	617/1375	4.44	4.62	4.27	4.37	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.53	4.20	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	180/1533	4.75	4.34	4.04	4.04	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	294/1512	4.63	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	849/1623	4.22	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	191/1621	4.71	4.43	4.06	4.01	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.53	4.28	4.27	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	284/1559	4.83	4.57	4.29	4.33	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	247/1352	4.60	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.59	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 225 0101
 Title THEORY III:COUNTERPOIN
 Instructor: TRIPPROBERSON,
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1196
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	776/1649	4.48	4.62	4.28	4.29	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	702/1648	4.42	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1375	4.80	4.62	4.27	4.37	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	383/1595	4.68	4.53	4.20	4.22	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	366/1533	4.41	4.34	4.04	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	310/1512	4.62	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1623	4.54	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1440/1646	3.85	4.55	4.69	4.63	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1261/1621	3.90	4.43	4.06	4.01	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.73	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1564	4.71	4.53	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	4.75	4.57	4.29	4.33	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	4.29	4.41	3.98	4.07	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	253/ 288	2.50	3.78	3.68	3.65	2.50
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	239/ 312	3.53	3.77	3.68	3.59	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 225 0201
 Title THEORY III:COUNTERPOIN
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1197
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	577/1649	4.48	4.62	4.28	4.29	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	643/1648	4.42	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	8	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1375	4.80	4.62	4.27	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	4	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	227/1595	4.68	4.53	4.20	4.22	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	1	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	565/1533	4.41	4.34	4.04	4.04	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	4	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	279/1512	4.62	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	541/1623	4.54	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	10	7	1	3.50	1630/1646	3.85	4.55	4.69	4.63	3.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	812/1621	3.90	4.43	4.06	4.01	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.53	4.28	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.57	4.29	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	495/1352	4.29	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.99	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.19	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.21	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 288	2.50	3.78	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	2	0	8	1	3.73	198/ 312	3.53	3.77	3.68	3.59	3.73	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 227 0101
 Title THRY V:20TH CENT MUS A
 Instructor: VOLAJ, ALTIN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1198
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	2	1	2	9	4.07	1142/1649	4.07	4.62	4.28	4.29	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	1032/1648	4.13	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	199/1375	4.86	4.62	4.27	4.37	4.86		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	759/1595	4.31	4.53	4.20	4.22	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	2	4	2	5	1	1	2.46	1513/1533	2.46	4.34	4.04	4.04	2.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	2	1	1	3	5	3.67	1170/1512	3.67	4.32	4.10	4.14	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	883/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	731/1646	4.87	4.55	4.69	4.63	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1281/1621	3.64	4.43	4.06	4.01	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	2	1	0	9	4.08	1248/1568	4.08	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.84	4.70	4.73	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	1324/1564	3.69	4.53	4.28	4.27	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	931/1559	4.31	4.57	4.29	4.33	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	950/1352	3.70	4.41	3.98	4.07	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	921/1384	3.83	4.37	4.08	3.99	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	887/1382	4.17	4.65	4.29	4.19	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1181/1368	3.50	4.55	4.30	4.21	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.59	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MUSC 230 0101
 Title MUSICS OF THE WORLD
 Instructor: BECK, GINA C
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1199
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	21	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	617/1649	4.52	4.62	4.28	4.29	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	21	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	21	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	529/1375	4.52	4.62	4.27	4.37	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	21	13	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	****/1595	****	4.53	4.20	4.22	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	21	3	5	2	1	5	5	3.17	1400/1533	3.17	4.34	4.04	4.04	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	21	14	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	21	0	0	0	4	1	16	4.57	427/1623	4.57	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	21	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	332/1646	4.95	4.55	4.69	4.63	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1016/1621	3.93	4.43	4.06	4.01	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	652/1568	4.65	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	931/1572	4.75	4.84	4.70	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	833/1564	4.35	4.53	4.28	4.27	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	2	1	16	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.57	4.29	4.33	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	0	1	0	3	2	14	4.40	399/1352	4.40	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	3	1	2	3	2	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	4.37	4.08	3.99	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1160/1382	3.64	4.65	4.29	4.19	3.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1136/1368	3.64	4.55	4.30	4.21	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	31	7	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	2	1	13	1	3.76	171/ 288	3.76	3.78	3.68	3.65	3.76	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.93	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	2	0	10	1	3.77	191/ 312	3.77	3.77	3.68	3.59	3.77	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Other 6

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 261 0101
 Title TEACHING CHORAL SINGIN
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1200
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1327/1649	3.83	4.62	4.28	4.29	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	1577/1648	3.17	4.58	4.23	4.25	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.62	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1397/1595	3.50	4.53	4.20	4.22	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	4.04	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.32	4.10	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1462/1623	3.33	4.32	4.16	4.21	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.63	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1451/1621	3.25	4.43	4.06	4.01	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1426/1568	3.67	4.59	4.43	4.39	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.84	4.70	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1496/1564	3.00	4.53	4.28	4.27	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1424/1559	3.33	4.57	4.29	4.33	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	613/1384	4.33	4.37	4.08	3.99	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.21	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.52	3.95	3.89	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	5.00	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	5.00	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 312	4.50	3.77	3.68	3.59	4.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.80	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.89	4.42	2.00	****	

Course-Section: MUSC 261 0101
 Title TEACHING CHORAL SINGIN
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1200
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101
 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1201
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	464/1648	4.58	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	4.05	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	310/1512	4.60	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	169/1623	4.80	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1287/1646	4.40	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	270/1621	4.40	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1568	****	4.59	4.43	4.39	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1572	****	4.84	4.70	4.64	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1564	****	4.53	4.28	4.25	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1559	****	4.57	4.29	4.23	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	217/ 312	3.50	3.77	3.68	3.60	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101
 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1202
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	464/1648	4.58	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	4.05	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	310/1512	4.60	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	169/1623	4.80	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1287/1646	4.40	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	789/1621	4.40	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1568	****	4.59	4.43	4.39	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1572	****	4.84	4.70	4.64	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1564	****	4.53	4.28	4.25	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	****	4.57	4.29	4.23	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	217/ 312	3.50	3.77	3.68	3.60	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 303 0101
 Title MD CAMERATA--CHAMBER C
 Instructor: WANENCHAK, LEO
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1203
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	13	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	1027/1649	4.20	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	770/1648	4.35	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	13	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	****/1375	****	4.62	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	4	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	301/1595	4.69	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	19	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	4.05	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	19	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	6	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	780/1623	4.29	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	664/1646	4.90	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	4	10	4	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	****/1568	****	4.59	4.43	4.39	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/1572	****	4.84	4.70	4.64	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	****/1564	****	4.53	4.28	4.25	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1559	****	4.57	4.29	4.23	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	3.89	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	1	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	4	0	7	0	3.27	245/ 312	3.27	3.77	3.68	3.60	3.27
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 13	Under-grad 33	Non-major 29
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: MUSC 304 0101
 Title UMBC JUBILEE SINGERS
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1204
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	33	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	167/1649	4.92	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	33	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	33	2	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	****/1375	****	4.62	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	33	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	622/1595	4.42	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	33	4	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	4.05	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	33	5	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	33	2	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	****/1623	****	4.32	4.16	4.08	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	33	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	35	4	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1621	****	4.43	4.06	4.02	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	39	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1568	****	4.59	4.43	4.39	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	39	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1572	****	4.84	4.70	4.64	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	39	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	****/1564	****	4.53	4.28	4.25	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	39	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1559	****	4.57	4.29	4.23	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	40	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	43	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	3	0	2	0	2.80	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 45
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Non-major 44
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 1
					Other 1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 305 0101
 Title UMBC COMMUNITY SYMPHON
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1205
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	41	4.91	167/1649	4.91	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	38	4.82	202/1648	4.82	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	35	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	****/1375	****	4.62	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	32	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	****/1595	****	4.53	4.20	4.21	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	34	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	4.05	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	38	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	13	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	189/1623	4.78	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	44	4.98	28/1621	4.98	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.98	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	101/1564	4.95	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	205/1559	4.90	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	5	1	0	3	0	15	4.47	331/1352	4.47	4.41	3.98	3.97	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	135/1384	4.92	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	312/1382	4.83	4.65	4.29	4.37	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	33	4	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	2	0	3	0	6	3.73	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	1	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	0	1	0	9	1	3.91	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 40	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 20
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 16	Under-grad 45 Non-major 25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MUSC 307A 0101
 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1206
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	241/ 243	1.00	2.67	4.12	3.89	1.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.63	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307C 0101
 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1207
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 307D 0101
 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE-GUITAR
 Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1208
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.02	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307E 0101
 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1209
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	4.05	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.23	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	4.37	4.08	4.11	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	4.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307F 0101
 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1210
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	195/1648	4.83	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1370/1559	3.50	4.57	4.29	4.23	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.55	4.30	4.39	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.52	3.95	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 307G 0101
 Title SMALL ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1211
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	4.00	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	2.67	4.12	3.89	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	3.00	4.06	3.59	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.21	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.43	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.32	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 312	5.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.32	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.16	4.44	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.80	4.43	5.00	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.89	4.42	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 110	5.00	4.60	3.99	4.05	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307I 0101
 Title JAZZ GUITAR QUARTET
 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1212
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	4.05	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.67
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307K 0101
 Title VOCAL ARTS ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: KING, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1213
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1116/1649	4.10	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	839/1648	4.30	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1595	****	4.53	4.20	4.21	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1434/1623	3.40	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1322/1559	3.67	4.57	4.29	4.23	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	293/ 555	4.50	4.80	4.29	4.22	4.50	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307L 0101
 Title COLLABORATIVE PIANO
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1214
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.02	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.23	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	4.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 308 0101
 Title UMBC WIND ENSEMBLE
 Instructor: VILLANUEVA, JAR
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1215
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	11	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	475/1648	4.57	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1375	****	4.62	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	12	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1595	****	4.53	4.20	4.21	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1623	****	4.32	4.16	4.08	****	
8. How many times was class cancelled	15	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1646	****	4.55	4.69	4.67	****	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1621	****	4.43	4.06	4.02	****	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1568	****	4.59	4.43	4.39	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1572	****	4.84	4.70	4.64	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1564	****	4.53	4.28	4.25	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	****	4.57	4.29	4.23	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	323/ 555	4.40	4.80	4.29	4.22	4.40	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	3	0	3	1	3.29	244/ 312	3.29	3.77	3.68	3.60	3.29	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1216
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1398/1646	4.25	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	4.00	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 318 0101
 Title DIGITAL AUDIO PROCESSI
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1217
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	195/1648	4.83	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1621	****	4.43	4.06	4.02	****	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	342/1564	4.75	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1382	4.80	4.65	4.29	4.37	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	4.52	3.95	4.00	4.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 321 0101
 Title: MUSIC HISTORY I
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1218
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	3	6	19	4.57	550/1649	4.57	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	1	4	8	15	4.32	811/1648	4.32	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	391/1375	4.68	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	6	0	0	5	5	12	4.32	746/1595	4.32	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	2	4	19	4.48	388/1533	4.48	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	6	1	4	2	4	10	3.86	1055/1512	3.86	4.32	4.10	4.11	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	2	1	9	15	4.37	671/1623	4.37	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	1	0	17	8	2	3.36	1640/1646	3.36	4.55	4.69	4.67	3.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	14	8	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	554/1568	4.71	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	296/1572	4.95	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	1	1	3	4	12	4.19	1001/1564	4.19	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	804/1559	4.43	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	1	2	2	4	7	3.88	836/1352	3.88	4.41	3.98	3.97	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.37	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.39	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 23
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 33	Non-major 10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 21		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0102
 Title: MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1219
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	776/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	702/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	546/1375	4.17	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	890/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	476/1533	4.37	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	755/1512	4.22	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1029/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1103/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1151/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1121/1568	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.82	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	651/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	695/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1219/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	795/1384	4.48	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1382	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	645/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	3.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	3.89	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0102
 Title: MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: WANENCHAK, LEO (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1220
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	776/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	702/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	546/1375	4.17	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	890/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	476/1533	4.37	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	755/1512	4.22	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1029/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1103/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1302/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1121/1568	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1241/1572	4.82	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	342/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	695/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	795/1384	4.48	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1382	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	426/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	645/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	3.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	3.89	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0103
 Title: MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1221
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	871/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	4.17	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1533	4.37	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1512	4.22	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1037/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	914/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	4.82	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	512/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1049/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.48	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	3.89	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0103
 Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1222
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	871/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	4.17	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1533	4.37	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1512	4.22	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1037/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	914/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	4.82	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	651/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.48	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	3.89	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0104
 Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1223
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1513/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1245/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1375	4.17	4.62	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	672/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	653/1533	4.37	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	817/1512	4.22	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	849/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	881/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1192/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1145/1568	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	894/1572	4.82	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	473/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	987/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	457/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	613/1384	4.48	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	676/1382	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	207/ 312	3.89	3.77	3.68	3.60	3.67	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0104
 Title: MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1224
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1513/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1245/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1375	4.17	4.62	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	672/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	653/1533	4.37	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	817/1512	4.22	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	849/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	881/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	133/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1568	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	4.82	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	234/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	457/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	613/1384	4.48	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	676/1382	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	207/ 312	3.89	3.77	3.68	3.60	3.67	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0106
 Title: MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1225
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	433/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1408/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1328/1375	4.17	4.62	4.27	4.22	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1335/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	545/1533	4.37	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1170/1512	4.22	4.32	4.10	4.11	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1318/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1037/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.82	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	854/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	512/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	690/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.48	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	522/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	844/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	3.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	229/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0106
 Title: MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1226
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	433/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1408/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1328/1375	4.17	4.62	4.27	4.22	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1335/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	545/1533	4.37	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1170/1512	4.22	4.32	4.10	4.11	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1318/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1037/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1426/1568	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.82	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1127/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	901/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1049/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.48	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	483/1382	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	522/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	844/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	3.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	229/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0112
 Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1227
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	4.37	4.34	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	4.22	4.32	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	4.82	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.48	4.37	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	241/ 243	1.00	2.67	4.12	3.89	1.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.55	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.30	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.46	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	50/ 52	1.00	3.00	4.06	3.59	1.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.21	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0112
 Title: MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1228
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	4.37	4.34	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	4.22	4.32	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	4.82	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.48	4.37	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	241/ 243	1.00	2.67	4.12	3.89	1.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.55	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.30	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.46	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	50/ 52	1.00	3.00	4.06	3.59	1.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.21	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0113
 Title: MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1229
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	1603/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1481/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1335/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1180/1533	4.37	4.34	4.04	4.05	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	883/1512	4.22	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1318/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1193/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1261/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1279/1568	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.39	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	4.82	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	1370/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1301/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	4.48	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1382	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	1.00	2.67	4.12	3.89	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	3.89	3.77	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0113
 Title: MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE
 Instructor: VILLANUEVA, JAR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1230
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	1603/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1481/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1335/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1180/1533	4.37	4.34	4.04	4.05	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	883/1512	4.22	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1318/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1193/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1577/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1515/1568	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.39	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1241/1572	4.82	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1496/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	4.48	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1382	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	1.00	2.67	4.12	3.89	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	3.89	3.77	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 362 0101
 Title ARTS IN EDUCATION
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1231
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	203/1649	4.89	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	212/1375	4.83	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	144/1595	4.89	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.11	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	448/1623	4.56	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.02	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	4.80	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.23	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.97	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	4.00	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.60	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 380 0101
 Title INTRO TO CONDUCTING
 Instructor: LOVE, JASON
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1232
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	306/1649	4.78	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	244/1648	4.78	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	334/1375	4.72	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	372/1595	4.61	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	476/1533	4.40	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	465/1512	4.44	4.32	4.10	4.11	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	915/1623	4.17	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	109/1621	4.87	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	196/1568	4.92	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1572	4.92	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	225/1564	4.85	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	164/1559	4.92	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	5	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	247/1352	4.60	4.41	3.98	3.97	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	661/1384	4.27	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	342/1382	4.80	4.65	4.29	4.37	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	493/1368	4.70	4.55	4.30	4.39	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	137/ 948	4.71	4.52	3.95	4.00	4.71	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	1	0	8	2	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 2		

Course-Section: MUSC 390B 0301
 Title VOICE
 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1233
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390D 0101
 Title VIOLA
 Instructor: LAMBROS, MARIA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1234
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.02	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	4.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	291/ 312	2.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	2.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1235
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	4.05	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.02	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390I 0101
 Title FLUTE
 Instructor: CELLA, LISA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1236
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.02	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390J 0101
 Title OBOE
 Instructor: LANDE, VLADIMIR
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1237
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.50
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390V 0101
 Title ELECTRIC BASS
 Instructor: BALDWIN, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1238
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	4.05	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1644/1646	3.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	4.11	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390W 0201
 Title UPRIGHT BASS
 Instructor: RUAS, LAURA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1239
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.02	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0101
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1240
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	4.14	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.26	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.71	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.95	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 401 0101
 Title SPECIAL PROJECTS: COMP
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1241
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1591/1648	3.00	4.58	4.23	4.36	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.53	4.20	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1441/1533	3.00	4.34	4.04	4.14	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.32	4.16	4.27	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.71	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	4.31	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 417 0101
 Title SPEC TPCS IN MUSC TECH
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1242
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.36	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	4.34	4.04	4.14	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1266/1512	3.50	4.32	4.10	4.26	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.32	4.16	4.27	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.24	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1568	****	4.59	4.43	4.54	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1572	****	4.84	4.70	4.79	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1564	****	4.53	4.28	4.40	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	****	4.57	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	4.35	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.56	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.58	****
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	4.31	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 417 0201
 Title SPEC TPCS IN MUSC TECH
 Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1243
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 480 0101
 Title TOPICS IN MUSC/ART/SOC
 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1244
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	195/1648	4.83	4.58	4.23	4.36	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	476/1533	4.40	4.34	4.04	4.14	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	133/1512	4.86	4.32	4.10	4.26	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1377/1646	4.29	4.55	4.69	4.71	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	208/1352	4.67	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	4.31	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.71	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.95	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 492 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1245
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	4.67	4.62	4.28	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.36	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	4.67	4.55	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 492 0301
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: SMITH, STUART S
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1246
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	4.67	4.62	4.28	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	4.14	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.26	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.67	4.55	4.69	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.24	5.00

Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.41	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 492 0401
 Title SENIOR PROJECT
 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1247
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1183/1649	4.67	4.62	4.28	4.50	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1537/1595	3.00	4.53	4.20	4.36	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	4.67	4.55	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.95	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	35/ 53	4.00	4.78	4.30	4.64	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.80	4.43	4.84	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.89	4.42	4.85	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 690 8010
 Title SEM: AMER CHAMBER MUSI
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1248
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.20	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	4.03	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.66	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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