FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR

Title

Instructor:

Baltimore County GENDELMAN, MART Fall 2008

Page 1137 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 74 Questionnaires: 74

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eanse	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	32	0	1	3	8	16	14		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	,	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		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		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			1425/1512		4.32	4.10	3.86	3.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	32	1	1	4	5	13	18		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		4.55	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		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		1344/1564		4.53	4.28	4.20	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	2	3	7	14	14		1211/1559		4.57	4.29	4.20	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	3	3	3	12	13	7		1064/1352			3.98		3.47
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	65	0	1	2	4	0	2		****/1384		4.37	4.08	3.86	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	65	0	1	1	2	2	3		****/1382		4.65	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	65	0	1	1	1	2	4		****/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			****	****	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	72	0	^	0	1	0	0	2 00	**** 00		F 00	4 5 4	4 21	****
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 73	0	0	0	1 1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81 ****/ 92	****	5.00	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	62	0	0	2	1	9	0		****/ 288	3.43	5.00 3.78	4.35 3.68	4.01 3.54	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	02	U	U	4	1	9	U	3.30	/ 200	3.43	3.70	3.00	3.34	
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 73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.16	4.17	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	73 73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.80	4.10	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	73 73	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.89	4.43	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	73	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.83	****
5. Mere energy proceeds for all the students	15	U	U	U	_	U	U	3.00	, 110		1.00	3.99	3.03	

Title FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR

Instructor: Questionnaires: 74

GENDELMAN, MART

Enrollment: 74 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1137 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	20	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-		_	
				?	1						

FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR

Title TANOSAKI, KAZUK

Instructor: Enrollment:

25 Questionnaires: 25

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1138 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncie	g		Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	328/1649		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		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		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		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		1617/1646		4.55	4.69		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		1491/1564		4.53	4.28	4.20	3.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	4	6	4		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	1.0	0	2	1	4	1	4	2 47	1007/1204	3.47	4 27	4.08	2 06	2 47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10 10	0	1	0	4	4 7	5	4.00	1097/1384 946/1382	4.00	4.37 4.65	4.08	3.86 4.03	3.47 4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.00	931/1368	4.00	4.55	4.29	4.03	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	1	1	2	1	1		****/ 948	****	4.53	3.95	3.75	****
4. Were special techniques successiui	10	9	1	1	۷	1		3.00	/ 940		4.52	3.95	3.75	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 221	****	5.00	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 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		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	4	0	3	1		255/ 312		3.77	3.68		3.13
1. 1. I ship show holy you cally out field detivities		J	3	•		3	_	3.13	200/ 012	3.13	3.77	3.00	3.31	5.15
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 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	****

Title FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR

Instructor: TANO

TANOSAKI, KAZUK

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1138 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	8	 Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0101 University of Maryland

Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB I Baltimore County
Instructor: TRIPPROBERSON, (Instr. A) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 21
Ouestionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1139

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean 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 \*\*\*\* 6 0 1 4 6 3 1 2.93 1551/1623 3.64 4.32 4.16 4.08 2.93 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 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 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 2 4 1 1 3.13 1306/1382 4.06 4.65 4.29 4.03 3.13 0 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 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 243 \*\*\*\* 2.67 4.12 4.08 \*\*\*\* 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 1 0 0 0 4 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 555 \*\*\*\* 4.80 4.29 4.14 \*\*\*\* Seminar 18 1 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 \*\*\*\*/ 288 \*\*\*\* 3.78 3.68 3.54 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 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 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 1.00 \*\*\*\*/ 53 \*\*\*\* 4.78 4.30 4.17 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Majors \_\_\_\_\_\_ 00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 14 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 28-55 1 3.00-3.49 1 3.50-4.00 General 56-83 0 0 Under-grad 21 Non-major 7 D 0 84-150 0 F 0 Grad. 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough

Other

13

P 0

т 0

?

MUSICIANSHIP LAB I

Title 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
---------	--------	------------	---------------

						Fr	_	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1 Did voi	ı gəin ne	ew insights, skills	from this course	4	0	0	4	7	6	Λ	3 1 2	1591/1649	4.37	4.62	4.28	4.11	3.12
		ctor make clear the		4	0	0	5	7	3	2		1585/1648		4.58	4.23	4.16	3.12
		lestions reflect th		4	0	2	2	6	5	2		1303/1048		4.62	4.27	4.10	3.18
	_	lations reflect the		4	2	1	5	6	3	0		1571/1595		4.53	4.20	4.03	2.73
			to what you learned	5	9	1	2	3	1	0		1504/1533		4.34	4.04	3.87	2.57
	_	-	e to what you learned	5	11	1	1	3	0	0				4.32	4.10	3.86	****
		g system clearly ex	-	6	0	1	4	6	3	1		1551/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	2.93
	-	was class cancelle	-	5	0	0	0	0	15	1		1521/1646		4.55	4.69	4.67	4.06
	-		eaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	305/1621		4.43	4.06	3.96	3.59
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures we	ll prepared	8	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	715/1568	4.47	4.59	4.43	4.39	3.91
		ctor seem intereste		8	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	1333/1572	4.40	4.84	4.70	4.64	3.69
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presented an	d 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	e lecture	es contribute to wh	at 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 aud	diovisual	l techniques enhanc	e 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 cla	ass disc	ussions 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 al	ll studer	aged 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	e instru	ctor encourage fair	and open discussion	13 13	0	3	3	1	1	0	2.00	1356/1368	3.50	4.55	4.30	4.01	2.00
4. Were sp	id the instructor encourage fair and open discus ere special techniques successful				3	1	0	4	0	0	2.60	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****
		Laboratory															
			ackground information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	, -		2.67	4.12	4.08	****
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab reports	clearly specified	16	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	***	4.80	4.29	4.14	****
		Seminar															
_		ons contribute to w	-	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	1.00	, -		5.00	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were ci	riteria 1	for grading made cl	ear	18	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****
		Field Work															
		rience contribute t		20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	, -		3.00	4.06	3.72	****
		y understand your e		20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,		5.00	4.09	3.65	****
5. Did cor	nierences	s help you carry ou	t field activities	15	1	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****
1 5'1		Self Pace		0.0	0	-	0	0	0	0	1 00	*****/ 53	4.4.4.4	4 50	4 20	4 10	***
I. Did sel	II-paced	system contribute	to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.17	****
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra						Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 7					quir	 ed f	or M	 ajor	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	14
28-55	1 0	1.00-1.99 0 2.00-2.99 0	B 4 C 2		C.	nome	1				0	IIndo	rad 1	0.1	Nor	madax	7
56-83 84-150	0	2.00-2.99 0 3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Gei	nera	Т				U	Under-g	rad 2	21	Non-	major	/
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
			P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

I

?

0

0

13

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 MUSICIANSHIP LAB I

Instructor: TRIPPROBERSON, (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1141

Job IRBR3029

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	-	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	new insights,ski	_	m 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 th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	4.37	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
3. Did th	ne exam q	questions reflec	t the e	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 ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	4.04	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	2.57	4.34	4.04	3.87	****
		ng system clearl		ined	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1029/1623	3.64	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00
		was class canc			4	0	0	0	0	1	1		1193/1646		4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	914/1621	4.11	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.25
		Lectur																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.47	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	n 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 le	cture ma	terial presente	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 th	e lectur	es contribute t	you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.30	4.57	4.29	4.20	4.50	
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.63	4.37	4.08	3.86	****
2. Were a	ıll stude	ents actively en	courage	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1382	4.06	4.65	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	3.50	4.55	4.30	4.01	***
4. Were s	special t	echniques succe	ssful	_	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****
		Labora	torv															
2. Were y	ou provi		-	ground information	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.08	****
				early specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nference			ield activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	'arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				P.e.	asons	2			Ty	ne			Majors	
									, 								, 	
00-27	0	A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0		
28-55 56-83	1 1	B 0 C 0		0	0000	1				0	IIndox ~	ma d	6	More	mo i o	6		
84-150	0	2.00-2.99	C 0 D 0		Ge	nera	Т				U	Under-g	ıau	6	non-	-major	6	
84-150 Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	0 2	D 0 F 0		רקד	ecti <sup>.</sup>					0	#### - :	Moona +	·homo -			.h
GLau.	U	3.30-4.00	۷	P 0		E.L	-CLI	ves				U	respons				_	111
				I 0		0+1	her					2	respons	co LU L	e sign	ıııcaı	10	
				Ι 0		UL.	TICT					4						

? 0

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0201 University of Maryland
Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB I Baltimore County

Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB I Baltimore County
Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 6 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

								_	ncies	5	_		tructor		Dept		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	4.37	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
		ctor make clear			4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	4.37	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
3. Did th	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	4.33	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	4.04	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	2.57	4.34	4.04	3.87	****
7. Was th	e gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1029/1623	3.64	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.45	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621	4.11	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.25
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.47	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did th	e instru	n 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 le	cture ma	xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	4.27	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.50		
4. Did th	e lectur	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 au	diovisua	our understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	4.39	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00		
		Discus																
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	3.63	4.37	4.08	3.86	****
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1382		4.65	4.29	4.03	****
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1368		4.55	4.30	4.01	****
		echniques succe			5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 948		4.52	3.95	3.75	****
		Labora	t oru															
2 Were v	ou provi		-	ground information	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.08	****
		nts for lab rep			4	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 555		4.80	4.29	4.14	****
J. Wele I	equiteme	ics for tab rep	DIES CI	early specified	-	1	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/ 555		1.00	4.20	1,11	
		Field																
5. Did co	nference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	***	3.77	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	.ency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27							quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	В 0		~		,				•	1	,	_			_		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	Т				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								0			1			1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		E⊥€	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	111
				P 0 I 0		0-1						2	respons	es to b	e sign	ııııcar	lL	
				5 U		Uti	her					2						
				? U														

Page 1142

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0301 University of Maryland Title FEB 11, 2009 MUSICIANSHIP LAB I

Baltimore County Instructor: POLLAUF, JACQUE (Instr. A) Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:

FIII OIIIIIEIIC.	O
Questionnaires:	6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1143

							Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1 Did vo	ou gain ne	Genera. w insights,skil		this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1649	4.37	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1648	4.37	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
		uestions reflect			1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.33	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.80
		uations reflect			1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	636/1595	4.04	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.40
			_	hat you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/1533	2.57	4.34	4.04	3.87	****
	_	-		what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****
		g system clearly		2	1	0	0	1	0	2	2		1029/1623	3.64	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1646		4.55	4.69	4.67	4.80
				ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	374/1621		4.43	4.06		4.50
3. 110W WO	outu you s	grade ene overa.	LI CCGCI	ing cricociveness	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	_	1.50	37171021		1.15	1.00	3.70	1.50
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lectures	s well r	repared	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	4.47	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
		ctor seem intere			4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	4.40	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
			plained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	4.27	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.83	
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute to	ou learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.30	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques enl	our understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	4.39	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00	
		_	_															
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contribu	ite to w	hat 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 a	all studer	nts actively end	couraged	l 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 th	ne instruc	ctor encourage i	fair and	l 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 s	special te	echniques succes	ssful		4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****
				Frequ	lency	/ Dist	tribu	ıtio:	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	 1	0.00-0.99	 A 5		 Re/	 miir		or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		0	Majo		5	
28-55	0	B 0		1/6/	JUTTE	Lu I	OT 1416	1101	٥	J	Graduati	_	U	Ma JC	<i>,</i> _	J		
56-83	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	1		
84-150	0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0	D 0		061	ici a.	-				•	onaci -g.	Luu	•	14011		_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		E14	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh	
oraa.	J	3.30 1.00	0	P 0								•	respons				_	
				I 0		Ot.1	her					5	10050110					
				? 0		001						-						

Course-Section: MUSC 110 0301 University of Maryland Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB I Baltimore County

Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1144

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

								_	ncie		_		ructor	Course	_			
		Question				NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		Genera																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om 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 th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1648	4.37	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.0
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.33	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.8
4. Did ot	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	636/1595	4.04	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.4
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	2.57	4.34	4.04	3.87	***
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learne	d 1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	***
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearl	y expla	ained	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1029/1623	3.64	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.0
8. How ma	any times	was class cand	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1646	4.45	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.8
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectivenes	s 2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	374/1621	4.11	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.5
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	4.47	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.0
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	4.40	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.0
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.27	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.8
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.30	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.0
5. Did au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance :	your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	4.39	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.0
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	3.63	4.37	4.08	3.86	4.5
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	4.06	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.0
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	3.50	4.55	4.30	4.01	5.0
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	_	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	***
				Fre	quency	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grade	s			Re	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99		A 5		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	3	U	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		_		-				0	TTm d a sa au	,	_			_

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	 Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				2	Ω						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0301

0

2

Music Repertoire

Yoshioka, Airi

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires:

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 19 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

								Fre	equei	ncie	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1																
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this cours	se	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.50
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	5.00
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goal	Ls	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	5.00
		eadings contrib				0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	5.00
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you l	Learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled	_		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effecti	veness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	5.00
		Labora	tory																
5. Were r	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	learly specif	ied	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	***	4.01	4.29	4.14	5.00
		Field	Work																
5. Did co	onference	s help you carr	y out i	field activit	cies	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	****	3.81	3.68	3.51	4.00
					Freque	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades				Rea	ason	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A	1		Red	auir	 ed fo	or Ma	aior:		0	Graduat		0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0		100	-10-1-	-	O	., 0	_		or addago	_	•	110000	-	ŭ
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0		001		_				-	011001 9		_	2.011		3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
y <del>-</del>	-	2.22 2.30	_	P	0								-	respons				_	
				I	0		Ot.1	her					1		50 2	- 5251			
				-	-														

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0601 University of Maryland
Title MUSIC REPERTOIRE Baltimore County
Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS Fall 2008
Enrollment: 16

Questionnaires: 16

Page 1145 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6	-				-	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12	-			
				2	Λ						

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

			Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		4.84	4.70	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1		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		4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	399/1352		4.41		3.86	
Discussion				_										
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	359/1384		4.37	4.08	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	6		676/1382		4.65	4.29	4.03	
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	****
Frem					_									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	3					_	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-	•	_	
				2	0						

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	\$		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			General																
1. D	oid you	ı gain ne	w insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	4	0	0	6	5	2	1	2.86	1625/1649	3.83	4.62	4.28	4.11	2.86
2. I	oid the	instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	4	0	2	5	6	1	0	2.43	1638/1648	3.65	4.58	4.23	4.16	2.43
3. I	oid the	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	4	0	0	4	5	3	2	3.21	1293/1375	4.07	4.62	4.27	4.10	3.21
4. I	oid oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	5	2	1	4	1	3	2	3.09	1528/1595	3.86	4.53	4.20	4.03	3.09
5. I	oid ass	signed re	eadings contribu	ite 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
					o what you learned	4	5	0	3	5	0	1	2.89	1462/1512	3.68	4.32	4.10	3.86	2.89
			g system clearly		ined	4	0	0	4	5	4		3.14	1512/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	3.14
		-	was class cance			4	0	0	0	0	9			1325/1646		4.55	4.69		4.36
9. H	low wor	ıld you g	grade the overal	.l teac	ning effectiveness	7	0	4	3	4	0	0	2.00	1610/1621	3.38	4.43	4.06	3.96	2.00
			Lecture																
			ctor's lectures			7	0	4	1	2	4			1553/1568		4.59	4.43	4.39	2.55
			tor seem intere			7	0	2	4	4	1	0		1570/1572	3.65	4.84	4.70	4.64	2.36
					xplained clearly	7	0	3	3	5	0			1555/1564		4.53	4.28		2.18
			es contribute to			8	0	3	3	2	2	0		1540/1559	3.55	4.57	4.29	4.20	2.30
5. E	oid aud	liovisual	techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	9	4	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1293/1352	3.50	4.41	3.98	3.86	2.60
			Discuss																
					what you learned	13	0	0	4	1	0	0		1359/1384			4.08	3.86	2.20
					d to participate	13	0	1	3	1	0	0		1374/1382	3.22	4.65	4.29	4.03	2.00
					d open discussion	13	0	1	3	0	1			1353/1368	3.48	4.55	4.30	4.01	2.20
4. W	Vere sp	ecial te	echniques succes	stul		13	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	***
5. W	Were re	equiremen	Laborat nts for lab repo	-	early specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	***	4.80	4.29	4.14	***
			Seminar																
5. W	Were cr	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		11	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.54	4.00
			Field W																
5. E	oid cor	ferences	s help you carry	out f	ield activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****
			Self F		_														
5. W	Were th	nere enou	igh proctors for	all t.	ne students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.83	***
					Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı									
Cred	dits Ea	irned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-	-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	14
28-		1	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-		1	2.00-2.99	0	C 4		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	major	4
	-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														_
Gra	ad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1				_	jh
					P 0							_		response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
					s 0 I 0		Otł	ner				1	2						
					<i>:</i> U														

BEGINNING VOICE CLASS

Title Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 20

84-150

Grad.

2

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

4

D

F

Р

I

0

0

0

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1148 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Se
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Ме
General														
. 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.
. 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.
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
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
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	3	1	4	2	4		1381/1533		4.34	4.04	3.87	3
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	1	3	0	1		1395/1512		4.32	4.10	3.86	3
Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	3	2	5	5	2		1528/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	3
How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646		4.55	4.69	4.67	5
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
Lecture														
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
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	Ę
Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	3		4.67			4.53	4.28	4.20	4
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87			4.57	4.29	4.20	4
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
Discussion														
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
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
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
Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	4.52	3.95	3.75	4
Laboratory														
Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.08	*
Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212		****	4.40	4.43	*
Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	*
Seminar														
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
Field Work														
Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	, -		3.00	4.06	3.72	*
Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48		5.00	4.09	3.65	*
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														
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	*
Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0				4.80	4.43	4.27	*
Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 24		4.89	4.42	4.24	*
Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.83	*
Freq	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
0-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 16				 ed f	or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	Majo		
8-55 4 1.00-1.99 0 B 0		re.	dart	cu I	OT INC	בטנ.	D	J	Graduat	_	J	ria J	<i>-</i>	
6-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ge:	nera	1			1	.2	Under-g	rad ?	20	Non-	-major	
4 150 0 2 00 2 40 2		GC.	c. a	-			_	-	onaci g			14011	ــ ال م	

Electives

0

Other

? 0

Course-Section: MUSC 172A 0101 University of Maryland Page 1149 Title DICTION Baltimore County

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

3

FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Instructor: KING, THOMAS Job IRBR3029

C+	a	T		0	
Student	Course	ĽVа.	Luation	Ouestionna	rre

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

Credits E	arned	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	В	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				2	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 173 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO CHORAL SINGIN Baltimore County

INTRO TO CHORAL SINGIN Baltimore County JACKSON, JANICE Fall 2008

Instructor: JACKSON, JAE

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1150 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			General	 I															
1. 1	nid vou	gain r	new insights,skil	=	this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1376/1649	3.75	4.62	4.28	4.11	3.75
			ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	0	2			1347/1648		4.58	4.23		3.75
			questions reflect			1	0	0	0	0	2			546/1375		4.62	4.27		4.50
4.	Did oth	er eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.33
5. 1	Did ass	igned r	eadings contribu	ite to v	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. 1	Did wri	tten as	signments contr	ibute 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	gradir	ng system clearly	explai	ned	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. 1	How man	y times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. 1	How wou	ld you	grade the overal	ll teach	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1192/1621	3.75	4.43	4.06	3.96	3.75
			Lecture																
			cuctor's lectures			1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	852/1568		4.59	4.43	4.39	4.50
			actor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0			5.00	1/1572				4.64	
					plained clearly	1	-	0		1				939/1564			4.28	4.20	
			res contribute to			1	0	0	0		0			1370/1559				4.20	
5.	Did aud	liovisua	al techniques enh	nance yo	our understanding	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.33
5. 1	Were re	quireme	Laborat ents for lab repo		early specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00
			Semina																
5. 1	Were cr	iteria	for grading made	e clear		2	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.54	4.00
			Field V	Vork															
5.	Did con	ference	es help you carry	out fi	leld activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 312	4.50	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.50
					Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Cre	dits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00	 -27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r )r	0
28	-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-									3 -		
56	-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	5
84	-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0													-	
Gra	ad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ıh
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
					I 0		Otl	her					0						
					? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 174 0101 University of Maryland Page 1151
Title BEG VOCAL METHODS Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	5			
Questionnaires:	5	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Instruc	tor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67 142	9/1649	3.67	4.62	4.28	4.11	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33 154	6/1648	3.33	4.58	4.23	4.16	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00 106	7/1595	4.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ***	*/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00 102	9/1623	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled		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	1	0	2	4.33 59	5/1621	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 26	2/ 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 6	8/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtioı	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	ı	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	1
				P	0	FIECCIVES		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 178A 0101

BEG KEYBOARD SKILLS Baltimore County

Title BEG KEYBOARD SKILLS
Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 1152 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		 General																
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,skil		m this course	5	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1037/1649	4.59	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.18
_	_	tor make clear			5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	148/1648	4.95	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.91
3. Did tl	he exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	xpected goals	5	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.90	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.80
4. Did of	ther evalua	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	5	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	236/1595	4.88	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.75
				what you learned	5	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	3.87	****
				o what you learned	5	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****
		system clearly		ined	5	0	0	1	0	1	9		358/1623	4.82	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.64
		was class cance			5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646			4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overal	l teacl	hing effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	595/1621	4.29	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.33
		Lecture	2															
1. Were	the instru	ctor's lectures	well p	prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did tl	he instruc	tor seem intere	sted in	n 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 le	ecture mate	erial presented	l and ex	xplained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	4.90	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.80
4. Did tl	he lecture	s 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 a	udiovisual	techniques enh	ance y	our understanding	11	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	914/1352	3.88	4.41	3.98	3.86	3.75
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did c	lass discu	ssions contribu	ite to 1	what you learned	13	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.86	****
	Were all students actively encouraged to participat						0	0	1	0	2		****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.03	****
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.01	****
	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussio . Were special techniques successful					1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****
		Laborat	ory															
5. Were	requiremen	ts for lab repo	rts cle	early 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 f	or grading made	clear		15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****
		Field W	lork															
5. Did co	onferences	help you carry	out f	ield activities	12	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00
		Self E	aced															
1. Did se	elf-paced :	system contribu	ite to v	what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.17	****
	-	cts with the ir		_	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	4.80	4.43	4.27	****
5. Were	there enoug	gh proctors for	all th	he students	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	4.60	3.99	3.83	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade					des Reasons								Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-27									or Ma			0	Graduat		0			11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	A 8 B 2		кес	4urr	eu I	or Mg	Jor	D	U	Graduat	=	U	Majo	)T	ТТ
56-83	0		0			Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	5
84-150	0 00 0 0 0 0					GEI	иста.	_				U	onder -g.	Luu I	. •	11011-	ila jul	J
Grad.					E14	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means +	here =	re not	enona	rh	
JI aa.	J	3.30 1.00	_	P 0		11.0	CCL	v CD				0	respons				_	111
				I O		Ot1	her				1	1	10000110					
				? 0							_							

Course-Section: MUSC 178A 0201 University of Maryland BEG KEYBOARD SKILLS Baltimore County Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Title

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

7

Page 1153 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did 1701	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski	_	thia gourgo	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1649	4.59	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1648	4.95	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
		uestions reflec			1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375	4.90	4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00
		uations reflect			1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1595	4.88	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00
				what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	1	0		****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y expla:	ined	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1623	4.82	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1037/1646	4.83	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	687/1621	4.29	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.25
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
				xplained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1564	4.90	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00
		es contribute t			4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.90		4.29	4.20	5.00
5. Did aud	d audiovisual techniques enhance your understandir.					1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	690/1352	3.88	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.00
		Discus																
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.86	****
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.01	****
		Labora																
5. Were re	equireme	nts for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00
		Field																
5. Did cor	nference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4	Required for Maj					iors	- – – -	0	Graduat		0	Majo	 or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0			-1 ~ -1 .		10		-	-	or adda.	-	-		_	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives						0	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h	
				P 0	210001.02						response	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt			
				I 0	0							4						
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 179A 0101 University of Maryland Title INTER KEYBOARD SKILLS

I

?

0

0

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S Enrollment: 13

Questionnaires: 13

Page 1154 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

24050101111			Seauchie Co.				O11 Q	40501	· · · · · ·	W							
						Fr	eque	ncies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 110	u soin n	General	s from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	1 22	871/1649	4.55	1 60	4.28	1 11	4.33
			the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2			464/1648		4.58	4.23		4.58
			the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	3			665/1375		4.62		4.10	
			the expected goals	1	3	0	1	0	1			440/1595			4.20		4.56
			te to what you learned	1	7	0	1	0	1		4.20			4.34	4.04		4.20
			oute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	1			****/1512		4.32	4.10	3.86	****
		g system clearly		1	1	0	0	1	2	8		358/1623		4.32	4.16		4.64
		was class cancel		1	0	0	0	0				597/1646		4.55	4.69		4.92
			teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	4			812/1621				3.96	
y. 110o	ala joa	grade one everall	codening cricesty and b	J	_	Ü	Ü	_	•	_		012,1021	1.25	1.15	1.00	3.70	
		Lecture															
		uctor's lectures		11	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/1568		4.59	4.43	4.39	****
			sted in the subject	11	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/1572		4.84	4.70	4.64	****
			and explained clearly	11 11	0	0	0	1	1			****/1564		4.53	4.28	4.20	****
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:				0	0	0	1	1			****/1559		4.57	4.29	4.20	****
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enha	nce your understanding	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1352	***	4.41	3.98	3.86	****
		Discussi	on														
1 Did cl	agg diga		te to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.86	****
			ouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1382		4.65	4.29	4.03	****
			ir and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1368		4.55	4.30		****
		echniques success		12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 948		4.52			****
	-	-															
		Laborato															
5. Were r	equiremen	nts for lab repor	ts clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	***	4.80	4.29	4.14	****
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading made	clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	***	3.78	3.68	3.54	****
		3 3															
		Field Wo															
5. Did co	nferences	s 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
			Frequ	iencv	Dist	trib	utio	n									
			11040														
Credits E	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ty	pe			Majors	\$		
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6					Pe	 สมร์ ห	ed f	or Ma	ior		0	 Graduat		0	Majo	 or	12
	28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 6				1,6,	2411	cu I	J⊥ 1·10	ΞΟ.	5		Graduat	_	0	ra J	<i>-</i>	14
56-83					Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	1
84-150	1		2 D 0		001		_				-	01.QC1 9	_ ~ ~ 1		1,011		_
Grad.	0		5 F 0	Electives					0	#### - Means there are not enough					rh		
	-		P 0								-		responses to be significant				•
P 0								1	2					-			

Other

12

Course-Section: MUSC 179A 0201

INTER KEYBOARD SKILLS

Title 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

		Frequencies		Instructor		ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean		Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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	****
	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			_	_	_	_	_							
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.31	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	4.30	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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	****
	m' 11 m 1														
-	Field Work	1.0	0	^	^	^	_	-	F 00	***** 50	also also also also	2 00	4 06	2 50	at at at at
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.72	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.36	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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
	0.16 D. 1														
_	Self Paced		•	•	•	•	•	_	F 06			4 50	4 00	4	4.4.1.1
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.17	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.16	4.06	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	4.80	4.43	4.27	****
	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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	1						

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
---------	--------	------------	---------------

Quanting	MD	377	Fre	equer			_		tructor	Course	-		Level	
Questions	NK	NA		2	3	4		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		****/ 30	****	5.00	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	2	2	2		3.80	33/ 41		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		4.89	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	****
Frem	encv	Diet	rih	ıtior	1									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 20

BEITH, NANCY S Fall

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 1157 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 0 0 2 2 1 0 4.57 1174/1572 4.72 4.84 4.70 4.64 4.   Mas 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.   Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 1 10 4.50 698/1559 4.45 4.57 4.29 4.20 4.   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.    Discussion   Discussion   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.   Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 2 3 2 4.00 946/1382 4.13 4.65 4.29 4.03 4.   Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 5 1 1 3.07 ****/ 948 **** 4.52 3.95 3.75 **  Laboratory   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   Were criteria for grading made clear	Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sec Mea
Did you gain new insights, skills from this course   4	G1														
Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   4		1	0	0	0	Е	1	1.0	1 21	000/16/0	1 06	1 60	1 20	1 11	1 2
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   5 0 0 0 0 3 2 10 4.47 593/1375 4.51 4.62 4.27 4.10 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. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   4 5 0 0 0 4 2 5 4.09 754/1533 4.05 4.34 4.04 3.87 4. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned   4 0 0 1 3 4 2 6 3.56 1363/1623 3.41 4.32 4.10 3.86 4. Nas the grading system clearly explained   4 0 0 1 3 4 2 6 3.56 1363/1623 3.41 4.32 4.10 3.86 4. Nas the grading system clearly explained   4 0 0 0 0 0 16 5.00 1/164 4.94 4.55 4.69 4.67 5. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness   6 0 0 0 0 5 6 3 3.86 1105/1621 3.89 4.43 4.06 3.96 3. New many times was clearly explained   4 0 0 0 0 0 16 5.00 1/164 4.94 4.55 4.69 4.67 5. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6 0 0 0 0 2 2 10 4.57 1174/1572 4.72 4.84 4.70 4.64 4. Nas lecture material presented and explained clearly   6 0 0 0 0 3 2 8 4.26 833/1564 4.31 4.53 4.29 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6 0 0 0 0 3 2 8 4.26 833/1564 4.31 4.53 4.29 4. Did the instruction seem interested in the subject   6 0 0 0 0 3 2 8 8 4.26 833/1564 4.31 4.53 4.39 4. Did the instruction seem interested and explained clearly   6 0 0 0 0 3 2 8 8 4.26 833/1564 4.31 4.53 4.39 4.70 4.64 4. Did the instruction seems interested and explained clearly   6 0 0 0 0 3 2 8 8 4.26 833/1564 4.31 4.53 4.39 4.90 4. Did the instruction seems seem and seems		4	•	U	-	2	1			,					
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	· · ·	_	-	-	_	-	-	-							
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4 5 0 0 0 4 2 5 4.09 754/1533 4.05 4.34 4.04 3.87 4. 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. Was the grading system clearly explained 4 0 0 1 3 4 2 6 3.56 1363/1623 3.41 4.32 4.16 4.08 3. Now many times was class cancelled 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 16 5.00 1/1646 4.94 4.55 4.69 4.67 5. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 0 5 6 3 3.86 1105/1621 3.89 4.43 4.06 3.96 3.  **Lecture**  **Lectur		_	-	-	-										
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 9 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.14 799/1512 4.14 4.32 4.10 3.86 4. Was the grading system clearly explained 4 0 1 3 4 2 6 3.56 3163/1623 3.41 4.32 4.16 4.08 3. How many times was class cancelled 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 5.00 1/1646 4.94 4.55 4.69 4.67 5. 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. How many times was class cancelled 4 0 0 0 0 0 1 6 5.00 1/1646 4.94 4.55 4.69 4.67 5. 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 3.06 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4				-			_	-							
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. How many times was class cancelled 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 16 5.00 1/1646 4.94 4.55 4.69 4.67 5. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0 0 5 6 3 3.86 1105/1621 3.89 4.43 4.06 3.96 3. 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. 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. 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. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 3 8 4.36 833/1564 4.31 4.53 4.28 4.20 4. 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. 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. Did audiovisual techniques enhance problem 13 0 1 0 5 0 1 3.00 1254/1384 3.06 4.37 4.08 3.86 3. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 2 3 2 4.00 946/1382 4.13 4.65 4.29 4.03 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 948 **** 4.52 3.95 3.75 **  **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 **  **Beinar**  **Were criteria for grading made clear**  **Pield Work**  **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.  **Self Paced**  **Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 ****/ 288 **** 3.78 3.68 3.51 3.  **Self Paced**  **Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 2 3.80 86/110 3.80 4.60 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.43 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.44 4.79 4.			-	-	-	_		-							
How many times was class cancelled			-	-		_	_			, -					
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.  Lecture  Mere 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.  Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 0 0 0 2 2 10 4.57 1174/1572 4.72 4.84 4.70 4.64 4.  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.  Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 3 1 10 4.50 695/1559 4.45 4.71 4.29 4.20 4.  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.  Discussion  Discussion  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.  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.  Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 ****/ 948 **** 4.52 3.95 3.75 **  Laboratory  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  Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 ****/ 288 **** 3.78 3.68 3.54 **  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.  Self Paced  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 30 **** 5.00 4.16 4.06 **  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 30 **** 5.00 4.16 4.06 **  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 13 1 0 1 0 0 2 3.80 86/110 3.80 4.60 3.99 3.83 3.  Frequency Distribution		_	•	_		_	_								
Lecture  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. 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. Mas 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. 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. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 2 0 1 1 3 7 4.33 457/1352 4.45 4.47 4.29 4.20 4. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 2 0 1 1 3 7 4.33 457/1352 4.45 4.47 4.93 4.86 3.86 4. 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. 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. 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. Were special techniques successful 13 4 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 948 **** 4.52 3.95 3.75 **  Laboratory  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  Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 ****/ 288 **** 3.78 3.68 3.54 **  Field Work  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.  Self Paced  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 4.06 **  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 13 1 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 29/ 41 3.98 4.80 4.43 4.74 4. Did study guestions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 2 3.80 86/ 110 3.80 4.60 3.99 3.83 3.  Frequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution			-	-		-	-								
Were the instructor's lectures well prepared   6	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	ь	U	U	U	5	ь	3	3.86	1105/1621	3.89	4.43	4.06	3.96	3.8
Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 6 0 0 0 2 2 1 0 4.57 1174/1572 4.72 4.84 4.70 4.64 4.   Mas 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.   Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 1 10 4.50 698/1559 4.45 4.57 4.29 4.20 4.   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.    Discussion   Discussion   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.   Were all students actively encouraged to participate 13 0 0 0 0 2 3 2 4.00 946/1382 4.13 4.65 4.29 4.03 4.   Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 13 0 0 0 5 1 1 3.07 ****/ 948 **** 4.52 3.95 3.75 **  Laboratory   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   Were criteria for grading made clear	Lecture														
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.	. 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.
Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 0 0 0 3 1 1 0 4.50 695/1559 4.45 4.57 4.29 4.20 4. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. Were special techniques successful 13 4 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 948 **** 4.52 3.95 3.75 **  Laboratory  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  Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 ****/ 288 **** 3.78 3.68 3.54 **  Field Work  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.  Self Paced  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.  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 30 **** 5.00 4.16 4.06 **  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.  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 13 1 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 29/ 41 3.98 4.80 4.43 4.27 4.  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 13 3 0 1 0 0 2 2 3.80 86/ 110 3.80 4.60 3.99 3.83 3.  Frequency Distribution	. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6		0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1174/1572	4.72	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.
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.  Discussion  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.  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 4.1  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.  Were special techniques successful 13 4 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 948 **** 4.52 3.95 3.75 **  Laboratory  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  Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 ****/ 288 **** 3.78 3.68 3.54 **  Field Work  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.  Self Paced  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.  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.  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 *****/ 30 ***** 5.00 4.16 4.06 **  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.  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 13 3 0 1 0 0 2 3.80 86/ 110 3.80 4.60 3.99 3.83 3.  Frequency Distribution	. 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.
Discussion Discussion 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. 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. 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. Were special techniques successful 13 4 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 948 **** 4.52 3.95 3.75 **  Laboratory 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 Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 ****/ 288 **** 3.78 3.68 3.54 **  Field Work 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.  Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.14 34/ 53 4.16 4.78 4.30 4.17 4. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 30 **** 5.00 4.16 4.06 ** 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. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 13 3 0 1 0 0 2 2 3.80 86/ 110 3.80 4.60 3.99 3.83 3.  Frequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution	. 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.
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. 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. 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. Were special techniques successful 13 0 0 0 5 1 1 3.43 1201/1368 3.28 4.55 4.30 4.01 3. Were special techniques successful 13 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 948 **** 4.52 3.95 3.75 **  Laboratory  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  Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 ****/ 288 **** 3.78 3.68 3.54 **  Field Work  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.  Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.14 34/ 53 4.16 4.78 4.30 4.17 4. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 30 **** 5.00 4.16 4.06 **  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. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 13 0 1 1 0 0 2 2 3.80 86/ 110 3.80 4.60 3.99 3.83 3.  Frequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution	. 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.
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. 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. 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. Were special techniques successful 13 0 0 0 5 1 1 3.43 1201/1368 3.28 4.55 4.30 4.01 3. Were special techniques successful 13 0 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 948 **** 4.52 3.95 3.75 **  Laboratory  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  Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 ****/ 288 **** 3.78 3.68 3.54 **  Field Work  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.  Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.14 34/ 53 4.16 4.78 4.30 4.17 4. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 30 **** 5.00 4.16 4.06 **  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. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 13 0 1 1 0 0 2 2 3.80 86/ 110 3.80 4.60 3.99 3.83 3.  Frequency Distribution  Frequency Distribution	Discussion														
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. 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. Were special techniques successful 13 4 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 948 **** 4.52 3.95 3.75 **  Laboratory  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  Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 ****/ 288 **** 3.78 3.68 3.54 **  Field Work  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.  Self Paced  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.  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 30 **** 5.00 4.16 4.06 **  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.  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 **  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.  Frequency Distribution		13	0	1	Ω	5	Ο	1	3 00	1254/1384	3 06	4 37	4 08	3 86	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. Were special techniques successful 13 4 0 0 2 0 1 3.67 ****/ 948 **** 4.52 3.95 3.75 **  Laboratory  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  Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 ****/ 288 **** 3.78 3.68 3.54 **  Field Work  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.  Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 1 4 4.14 34/ 53 4.16 4.78 4.30 4.17 4.  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 13 1 0 1 1 0 4 4.17 29/ 41 3.98 4.80 4.33 4.3 4.2 4.2 **  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 **  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.  Frequency Distribution						2									
Laboratory . Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18 0 1 0 0 0 1 3.67 ****/ 948 **** 4.52 3.95 3.75 **  Laboratory . 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 . Were criteria for grading made clear 17 0 0 1 0 2 0 3.33 ****/ 288 **** 3.78 3.68 3.54 **  Field Work . 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.  Self Paced . Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.14 34/ 53 4.16 4.78 4.30 4.17 4. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 30 **** 5.00 4.16 4.06 ** . 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 Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 13 3 0 1 0 0 3 4.25 ****/ 24 4.33 4.89 4.42 4.27 4 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.  Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors			-	-	-	5	-	_		,					
Seminar   Semi	. Were special techniques successful				-		_			. ,					**
Seminar   Semi	Laboratory														
Field Work  Did conferences help you carry out field activities  Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  Did study questions make clear the expected goal  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful  Were there enough proctors for all the students  Frequency Distribution  Reasons  Type  Majors  Majors	. 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	**
Field Work  Did conferences help you carry out field activities  Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned  Did study questions make clear the expected goal  Were your contacts with the instructor helpful  Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful  Were there enough proctors for all the students  Frequency Distribution  Reasons  Type  Majors  Majors	Comitmos.														
Field Work 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.  Self Paced Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.14 34/53 4.16 4.78 4.30 4.17 4. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 30 **** 5.00 4.16 4.06 ** 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. 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 ** 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.  Frequency Distribution  Redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	~	17	Λ	Λ	1	Λ	2	Λ	3 33	****/ 200	****	3 78	3 68	3 54	**
Self Paced  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.  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/30 **** 5.00 4.16 4.06 **  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.  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 **  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.  Frequency Distribution  Redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	. Were directia for grading made crear	Ι,	O	O	_	Ü	2	O	3.33	/ 200		3.70	3.00	3.31	
Self Paced  Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13 0 0 1 1 1 1 4 4.14 34/53 4.16 4.78 4.30 4.17 4.  Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ***/ 30 **** 5.00 4.16 4.06 **  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.  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 **  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.  Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors		1.4	0	0	0	0		0	2 22	020 / 210	2 22	2 55	2 60	2 51	2
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. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 30 **** 5.00 4.16 4.06 ** 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. 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 ** 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.  Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	2	Ü	4	U	3.33	239/ 312	3.33	3.77	3.68	3.51	3.
Did study questions make clear the expected goal 13 4 0 0 1 0 2 4.33 ****/ 30 **** 5.00 4.16 4.06 **  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.  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 **  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.  Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors															
. 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.  . 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 **  . 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.  Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13		0	1	1	1	4	4.14	34/ 53	4.16	4.78	4.30	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 ** . 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.  Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13		0		1	0	2	4.33	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.16	4.06	* *
. 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.  Frequency Distribution  redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	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.
Frequency Distribution redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	. 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	* *
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	. 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.
·	Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
00 07 1 0 00 0 0 7 14 Particul for Malars 0 Graduate 0 Malars	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	1			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 182 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title BEGINNING STRING CLASS TREMBLAY, CHRIS

Instructor: Enrollment: 14

Questionnaires: 14

Fall 2008

Page 1158 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

			Questions			NR	NA	Fr	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 D	id voi	ı dəin ı	General new insights,skil		this gourse	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
			uctor make clear			3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
			questions reflect			2	6	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.67
			luations reflect			2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	119/1595	4.92	4.53	4.20	4.03	4.92
			readings contribu			2	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.34	4.04	3.87	4.33
6. D	id wr	itten a	ssignments contri	bute 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. Wa	as the	e gradi:	ng system clearly	explai	ned	3	1	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00
			s was class cance			2	0	0	0	-	11			1513/1646	4.08	4.55	4.69		4.08
9. H	ow wor	ıld you	grade the overal	l teach	ing effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	511/1621	4.40	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.40
			Lecture	:															
			ructor's lectures			8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
			uctor seem intere		3	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
			aterial presented			8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00
			res contribute to	_		8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00
5. D	id aud	diovisua	al techniques enh	ance yo	ur understanding	8	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.86	****
			Discuss	ion															
			cussions contribu			9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.37	4.08	3.86	4.80
			ents actively enc			9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00
			uctor encourage f		open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.01	5.00
4. W	ere sp	pecial	techniques succes	sful		10	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.75	****
			Laborat	-															
5. W	ere re	equirem	ents for lab repo	rts cle	arly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 555	***	4.80	4.29	4.14	****
			Seminar																
5. W	ere cı	riteria	for grading made	clear		13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	***	3.78	3.68	3.54	****
			Field W	lork															
5. D	id cor	nference	es help you carry	out fi	eld activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****
					Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Cred	its Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Туј	oe -			Majors	;
00-		0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	S	0	Graduat	9	0	Majo	or	9
28-		2	1.00-1.99	0	В 0 С 1		a		1				0	TTra el a sa ass		4	Man		F
56-1 84-1		1 2	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0 3	C 1 D 0		Ger	nera	Т				0	Under-g	Lau I	.4	NON-	-major	5
Grad		0	3.50-4.00	3 1	F 0		E14	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0 #### - Means there are not en		enous	rh			
Grad	<b>.</b>	U	3.30 1.00	_	P 0		11.0	CI	v CD					response					111
					I O		Oth	ner				1	1	I COP OND		91			
					? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1159

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 20
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: MUSC 188 0101

PERCUSSION CLASS

GOLDSTEIN, THOM

Title

Instructor:

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did	vou gain ne	General ew insights,skil		e cource	1	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	683/1649	4.47	4 62	4.28	4.11	4.47
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	154/1648		4.58	4.23	4.16	4.89
		uestions reflect			1	1	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1375			4.27		
	_	uations reflect	_	-	1	6	0	0	0	1	12	4.92			4.53	4.20	4.03	4.92
		eadings contribu			1	8	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	421/1533		4.34	4.04	3.87	
		signments contri			2	13	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1512		4.32	4.10	3.86	5.00
		g system clearly		o you rournou	1	2	0	0	2				416/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	4.59
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	1		4.95			4.55	4.69	4.67	
	-	grade the overal		effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	11		4.27	,					
		<u>.</u> .																
1 Woro	tho inatra	Lecture actor's lectures		rod	8	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.75
		ctor's lectures			8	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1572			4.43	4.64	
		terial presented			8	0	0	0	0	2			234/1564		4.53		4.20	
		es contribute to			9	0	1	0	2	1			1016/1559			4.29	4.20	
		l techniques enh			10	1	0	0	0	1	8		107/1352				3.86	
J. DIG	auuiovisual	r techniques enn	ance your u	nderstanding	10	_	U	U	U	1	0	4.05	107/1352	4.09	4.41	3.90	3.00	4.03
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did	class discu	ussions contribu	te 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 studer	nts actively enc	ouraged 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 instruc	ctor encourage f	air and ope	n 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 te	echniques succes	sful		14	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	365/ 948	4.20	4.52	3.95	3.75	4.20
		Laborat	OKY															
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab repo	_	specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00
J. MOZO	. 104011001	101 102 1050	rob Grearry	Specifica		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ū	Ü	Ü	3.00	1, 333	3.00	1.00	,		3.00
		Seminar																
5. Were	criteria f	for grading made	clear		18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****
		Field W	ork															
5. Did	conferences	s help you carry		activities	17	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	utior	ı									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Ex	pected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 A 14					or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	Majo		9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		Ke(	4utr.	EU I	⊃T IΔIÇ	יוטני	۵	J	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC	) <u> </u>	J
26-33 56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Cer	neral	1				6	Under-q	rad 3	20	Non-	-major	11
84-150		3.00-3.49	1	D 0		GEI	icia.	-				J	onder -g	1 u u 2	.0	11011-	ilia jui	11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		E14	ectiv	zes				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoud	rh
oraa.	Ü	3.30 1.00	-	P 0														
				I O		Oth	ner					8					-	
				? 0														
				-														

Course-Section: MUSC 189 0101 University of Maryland Title GUITAR CLASS Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: FORSHEE, ZANE Enrollment: 20

Ouestionnaires: 20

Page 1160 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 4 0 0 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 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 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 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1512 \*\*\*\* 4.32 4.10 3.86 \*\*\*\* 0 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 Ω Ω Ω 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 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 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 0 0 0 11 5.00 9 0 0 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 0 5 4.50 437/1384 4.50 4.37 4.08 3.86 4.50 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 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 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 948 \*\*\*\* 4.52 3.95 3.75 \*\*\*\* Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 19 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 221 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.16 4.05 \*\*\*\* 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 243 \*\*\*\* 2.67 4.12 4.08 \*\*\*\* 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 Ω Ω 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* 212 \*\*\*\* \*\*\* 4.40 4.43 \*\*\*\* 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 0 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\* / 209 \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\* 4.35 4.38 \*\*\*\* 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 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 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 88 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.54 4.31 \*\*\*\* 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.47 4.30 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 81 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.43 4.39 \*\*\*\* 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.35 4.01 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 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 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 \*\*\*\* 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 39 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.38 4.37 \*\*\*\* 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 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 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 53 \*\*\*\* 4.78 4.30 4.17 \*\*\*\* 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 30 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.16 4.06 \*\*\*\* 0 0 0 Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
 Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful
 Were there enough proctors for all the students 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 41 \*\*\*\* 4.80 4.43 4.27 \*\*\*\*

18 0 0

19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 24 \*\*\*\* 4.89 4.42 4.24 \*\*\*\*

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0101 University of Maryland Title PIANO FRANKLIN, RACHE

Instructor:

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1161 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

TIDEL ACCOL •	I ICHINICHIII, ICACIII	1411 2000
Enrollment:	5	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m 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 th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	4.93	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	4.75	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	the instru	actor's lecture	s 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 th	ne instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	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 a	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learne 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participat							0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00
				d 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 s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	3.75	5.00
		Labora	tory															
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early 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 co	onferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	 A 1					or Ma			0	 Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		r.e.	quil	EU I	J⊥ I*Ic	JOIS	•	U	Graduat	C	U	Ma J	) <u>T</u>	U
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Co	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		GEI	иста.	_				_	onder-9	Luu	4	INOII	a JUI	4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		E1	ecti	ves			0 #### - Means there are not			enous	rh			
02 00.	Ü	3.30 1.30	_	P 0							responses to be significant		_	,				
				I O		Ot.1	her					1	10050110		~-91			
				? 1														

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

-						~										
			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did way gain now	General insights,skills from t	-hia aouwao	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	1 06	220/16/0	4 02	1 60	1 20	1 11	1 06
	or make clear the exped		0	0	0	0	0	1 1	6 6	4.86	230/1649 182/1648		4.62	4.28	4.11	4.86 4.86
	stions reflect the exped			4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00			4.58	4.23	4.16	
_	_	-	0			0		-			1/1375		4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00
	tions reflect the expect		0	3	0	-	0	0	4	5.00	1/1595		4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00
_	dings contribute to wha	-	0	4	-	0	0	1	2	4.67	,		4.34	4.04	3.87	4.67
	gnments contribute to v		0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512		4.32	4.10	3.86	5.00
	system clearly explaine	ed	0	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20			4.32	4.16	4.08	4.20
8. How many times w			0	0	0	0	0	3			1130/1646		4.55	4.69	4.67	4.57
9. How would you gr	ade the overall teachir	ng 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 instruc	tor's lectures well pre	epared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
	or seem interested in t		4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572			4.70	4.64	5.00
	rial presented and expl		4	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1564		4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00
	contribute to what you	-	4	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1559		4.57		4.20	5.00
	techniques enhance your		4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352			3.98	3.86	5.00
J. Dia addiovibadi	cceniiques emianee your	diacibeanaing	-	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	1/1332	3.00		3.70	3.00	3.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to wha	at 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 student	s actively encouraged t	o 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 instruct	or encourage fair and o	pen 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 tec	hniques successful	_	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	3.75	****
	Laboratory															
2 Mana ren marrida	d with adequate backgro	und information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 243	****	2 67	4.12	4.08	****
	_		6 4	1	0	0	0	0	1 2		, -					
5. were requirement	s for lab reports clear	rly specified	4	Τ	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00
	Seminar															
5. Were criteria fo	r grading made clear		5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****
	Field Work															
1 Did field experi	ence contribute to what	vou learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.72	****
	understand your evaluat		6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48		5.00	4.09	3.65	****
	help you carry out fiel		5	1	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 312			3.68	3.51	****
5. Did Conferences	neip you carry out fre	id activities	5	_	U	U	U	1	U	4.00	/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.00	3.31	
	Self Paced															
	ystem contribute to wha		5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 53		4.78	4.30	4.17	5.00
3. Were your contact	ts with the instructor	helpful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.80	4.43	4.27	***
		Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
			_													
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	\$

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0401 University of Maryland Title VOICE Baltimore County Instructor: MARKOVICPRAKASH Fall 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

6

rersity of Maryland Page 1163 saltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Co	urse Evalu	uation Que	estionnaire
------------	------------	------------	-------------

	Ouestions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		-	UMBC Mean		
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	pected 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	e grading	g system clearl	y expla:	ined	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.00
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		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	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00
	Lecture																	
1. Were t	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				2		0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00
4. Did the	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00
Laboratory																		
5. Were r	5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield 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 se	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to v	what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 53	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.17	5.00
3. Were ye	our conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or 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	e feedbac	ck/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.89	4.42	4.24	5.00
				Free	quency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	5			Rea	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	 quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-									,		
56-83						Ge	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad	3	Non-	major	3
84-150													J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	ah
				P 0		BIECCIACO					responses to be significant				•			
				I 0		Other				1			3					
? 0																		

Course-Section:	MUSC 190C 0101	University of Maryland	Pa
Title	VIOLIN	Baltimore County	FEB 1
		- 11 0000	

Questionnaires: 3

Page 1164 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI Fall 2008 Enrollment: 5

Student (	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
-----------	--------	------------	---------------

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

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190C 0201 University of Maryland FEB 11, 2009 Title VIOLIN Baltimore County Job IRBR3029

Page 1165

Fall 2008 TREMBLAY, CHRIS Instructor:

Enrollment:	1	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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
Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	ı									

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

Course-Section	: MUSC 190D 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1166
Title	VIOLA	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	T.AMBDOG MADTA	Fall 2008	.Tob TRRR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title VIOLA Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: LAMBROS, MARIA Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 2

	Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	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	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	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

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190I 0201 University of Maryland Title FLUTE Baltimore County

Page 1167 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: KESNER, LORI

Questionnaires:	5	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	---	---------------	--------------	---------------

Enrollment:

7

		Ouestion	<b>a</b>		MD	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie:	5	_	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Question	5 			NA				- <del></del>		меап	Ralik		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om 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 instru	ctor make clear	the e	xpected 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 q	questions reflec	t the	expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.62	4.27	4.10	****
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the e	xpected 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 r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	3.87	****
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ibute	to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	3.86	****
7. Was	the gradin	g system clearl	y expl	ained	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1623	****	4.32	4.16	4.08	****
8. How 1	many times	was class canc	elled		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 overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1621	4.60	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.60
5. Were	requireme	Labora ents for lab rep Field	orts c	learly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.14	***
5. Did	conference			field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	***	3.77	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	nt	
				I 0		Otl	her					1	_					
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 190J 0101 University of Maryland Title OBOE Baltimore County Instructor: LANDE, VLADIMIR

Fall 2008

Page 1168

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fr 1	-	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did v	on gain n	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1124/1648		4.58	4.23	4.16	4.00
		was class cand		£ 2000 300 20	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1544/1646		4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00
				hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.00
		Lectur																
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 t	he instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 1	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.00
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.20	5.00
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	3.00
		Discus																
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		,		4.37	4.08	3.86	5.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		,		4.65			5.00
3. Did t	he instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.01	5.00
		Labora	-															
5. Were	requireme	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	522/ 555	2.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	2.00
		Field																
5. Did c	onference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00
				Frequ	iency	y Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajors	. – – -	0	 Graduat	 е	0	 Мајс	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					1	_		_			
				? 1														

Course-Section: MUSC 190Q 0201 Baltimore County BELZER, MATTHEW

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

SAXOPHONE

2

University of Maryland Page 1169 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	-	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute 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 th	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1533/1623	3.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	3.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s 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 th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o 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 au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00
		Discus	gion															
1 Did al	ace diec			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5 00	4.37	4.08	3.86	5.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1382		4.65	4.29	4.03	
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1362		4.55	4.30		5.00
		echniques succe		d Open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1308					5.00
	_	-																
2 Wome **		Labora	-	ground information	0	0	٥	0	1	0	0	3.00	220/ 243	2 00	2 67	1 10	4 00	2 00
Z. Were y	ou brovi	ded with adequa	ite back	ground information	U	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	220/ 243	3.00	2.07	4.12	4.00	3.00
	_	Field																
5. Did co	nference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		 Re	anir	ed f	or Ma	ior		n	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		100	-1011	ca I	O1 1710	- , 1	_	•	Gradac	_	•	1100	-	J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				_				_	011401 9		_	2.011		_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	лh
	-	2.22 2.00	-	P 0								-	respons					
				I O	Other				0					-				
	? 0				001101					-								

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

8

Course-Section: MUSC 190S 0201 University of Maryland Page 1170 Title PERCUSSION FEB 11, 2009 DOVE, BARRY Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	eque:	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General															
1 Did you	u dain net		from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	5.00
		tor make clear th		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1648		4.58	4.23		5.00
			he expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375		4.62	4.27		5.00
		ations reflect th		0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595			4.20	4.03	5.00
			to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1533		4.34	4.04		5.00
		system clearly e		0	0	0	0	1	0			502/1623		4.32			4.50
		was class cancell		0	0	0	0	0	2			1193/1646		4.55	4.69		4.50
			teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.50	374/1621				3.96	
		Lecture															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures w	ell prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
			ed in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1572		4.84	4.70	4.64	
			nd explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1564		4.53			5.00
		s contribute to w		2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1559		4.57			5.00
		Discussio	'n														
1. Did cla	ass discus		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
			raged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1382		4.65	4.29		5.00
			r and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1368			4.30		5.00
5. Were re	equirement	Laborator ts for lab report	y s 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 c	riteria fo	or grading made o	lear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.54	4.00
		Field Wor															
5. Did com	nferences	help you carry o	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 Pac															
1. Did se	lf-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
			Freq	uency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3		Per	 muir	ad f	 or Ma	iors		0	Graduat	 -	0	Majo		2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	<del></del>		I.C.	quii	eu r	OI Ma	. 101 6	5	U	Graduat	C	O	Majo	)I	2
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0			Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	2
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	ire not	enous	rh
	-		P 0							0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			•				
		Otl	her					2	-		3						
			3 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 190U 0101 University of Maryland
Title HARP Baltimore County
Instructor: POLLAUF, JACQUE Fall 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

University of Maryland Page 1171
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	Course	Firalistion	Ouestionnaire

						Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did	you gain n	ew 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 instru	ctor make clear the	e 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 gradin	g system clearly ex	kplained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00
8. How 1	many times	was class cancelle	ed	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 t	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 instr	uctor's lectures we	ell 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 instru	ctor seem intereste	ed 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 ma	terial presented ar	nd 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 lectur	es contribute to wh	nat 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	audiovisua	l techniques enhand	ce 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														
1. Did	class disc	ussions 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 stude	nts actively encour	raged 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 instru	ctor 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 t	echniques successfu	ıl	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	3.75	5.00
		Field Work	2														
5. Did	conference	s help you carry ou	at field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	4.00
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 1		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajors	 S	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	в 0														

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

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0301 University of Maryland Title RECITAL PREPARATION Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL

Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1172

Enrollment:	20			
Questionnaires:	19	Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire

								_	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	9	0	1	1	1	1	6	4 00	1183/1649	4.00	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.00
		tor make clear			9	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	556/1648		4.58	4.23	4.16	4.50
		estions reflec		1 0	9	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1375		4.62	4.27	4.10	5.00
	_	ations reflect		1 5	9	4	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1595		4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00
				what you learned	9	7	0	0	0	0	3		****/1533		4.34	4.04	3.87	****
				o what you learned	9	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	156/1512		4.32	4.10	3.86	4.80
		system clearl			9	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	,		4.32	4.16	4.08	4.67
		was class cance			9	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646		4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	12	1	0	0	0	1	5		121/1621				3.96	
J. 220	ara you g	rado ono overa		11119 01100017011055		_	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	,	1.05	121, 1021	1.05	1.15	1.00	3.70	1.00
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture			14	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1169/1568	4.20	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.20
		tor seem inter			14	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1419/1572	4.20	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.20
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained 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	e lecture	s contribute to	o what	you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1559	****	4.57	4.29	4.20	****
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.86	****
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	acc dican			what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5 00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.86	****
				d to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.03	****
				d open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1368		4.55	4.30	4.01	****
		chniques succes		d open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 948		4.52	3.95	3.75	****
4. Were s	peciai te	ciniques succes	SSLUI		10	U	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	/ 940		4.52	3.95	3.75	
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.54	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences			ield activities	17	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	***	3.77	3.68	3.51	****
				<b>D</b>		- <b>-</b>	2 1		_									
				Frequ	iency	Dist	cribi	ıtıoı	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Rec	 mire		or Ma	iors	. – – –	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo		10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		1000	1411	-u 10	O1 1710	- )		•	GEGGGGC	_	-	11000	-	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		GEI	c. a.	-				•	onder g	144 1		14011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		ភាភ	ectiv	700				0	#### -	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Ji au.	U	3.30-4.00	4	P 0		57.6	-C L I \	(CD				U	respons					111
				I 0		0+1	ner					8	respons	CD CO L	c argi	ııı ıcaı.	10	
				? 0		OCI	161					J						
				r U														

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			Fr 1	eque:	ncie:	s 4	_	Ins Mean	tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NK	NA						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		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		1/1512		4.32	4.10	3.86	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		1193/1646		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		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	4.09	3.65	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		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		1/ 30		5.00	4.16	4.06	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 41		4.80	4.43	4.27	5.00
Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 24		4.89	4.42	4.24	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students		0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 110		4.60	3.99	3.83	
			-	-	-	-			,					<del>-</del>
Frequ	ency	7 Dis	trib	ntio	n									

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 193A 0201	University of Maryland	Page 1174
Title	PIANO	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	UVMLEA LHUMVG	E-311 2008	Tob TDBD3020

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title PIANO Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	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	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

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0101 Title VOICE

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: KING, THOMAS
Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1175 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			General  qhts,skills from this course															
			_															
					0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649		4.62		4.11	5.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648		4.58	4.23	4.16	5.00
		estions reflec			0	1	0	0	1	0	0		1328/1375		4.62	4.27	4.10	3.00
		ations reflect			0	0 1	0	0	0 1	0	2	5.00	1/1595		4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00
				hat you learned	0	1	0	1	0	-	0		1441/1533		4.34	4.04	3.87	3.00
		ignments contr system clearl		what you learned	0	1	0	U T	0	0	1		1505/1512 1/1623		4.32	4.10	3.86 4.08	2.00
		was class canc		.nea	0	0	0	0	0	1	_		1193/1646		4.55	4.16 4.69	4.08	4.50
				ing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1621		4.43	4.09	3.96	
9. HOW WOL	ara you g	rade the overa	II teaci	ing effectiveness		U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	1/1021	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.90	5.00
		Lectur	е															
		ctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1568		4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
		tor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1572		4.84		4.64	5.00
				plained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1564		4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00
		s contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1559		4.57		4.20	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00
		Labora	torv															
5. Were re	equiremen		-	arly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were cr	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear		1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	266/ 288	2.00	3.78	3.68	3.54	2.00
		G 15																
1 54	16	Self			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	1/ 52	F 00	4 70	4 20	1 17	F 00
		cts with the i		hat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53 1/ 41	5.00 5.00		4.30	4.17	5.00 5.00
J. Were ye	Jul Colica	CCB WICH CHC I.	iibci accc	i ncipiui	_	O	O	O	O	Ü	_	3.00	1/ 11	3.00	1.00	1.15	1.27	3.00
				Frequ	lency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	auire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	0	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0			1			- 5								
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
	Р 0											respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt		
	I 0				Ot]	her					2							
				? 1														

Course-Section:	MUSC 193B 0301	University of Maryland	Page 1
Title	VOICE	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2

1176 2009 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	5	
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequenci					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	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			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
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	n									

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

Course-Section	: MUSC 193B 0401	University of Maryland	Page 1177
Title	VOICE	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009
Tratement on:	MADROTTCODARACII	E-11 2000	Tob IDDO2020

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: Job IRBR3029 MARKOVICPRAKASH Fall 2008 Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 1

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

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

Course-Section	: MUSC 193C 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1178
Title	VIOLIN	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI Fall 2008 Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires:	1	Student Co	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Frequencies						Course Dept				Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	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
Frequ	.ency	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected	l Grades	Reasons	Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 193F 0101

GUITAR

7

LAGANA, THOMAS

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

Page 1179 FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestion	s		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	3	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 5 1		Genera		. 1 . 1	•	•	0	0	•	-	-	4 00	0.45 /1.640	4 00	4 60	4 00	4 11	4 02
		ew insights,ski ctor make clear			0 1	0	0	0	0	1 2	5 3	4.83	247/1649 441/1648	4.83	4.62 4.58	4.28	4.11 4.16	4.83 4.60
					0	3	0	0	1	0	-		733/1375	4.33	4.62	4.23	4.10	4.33
	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.03	5.00
				what you learned	0	1 2	0	0	1	0	-	4.50	,	4.50	4.34	4.04	3.87	4.50
				o 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 th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.67
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1462/1646	4.17	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.17
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.43	4.06	3.96	4.67
	_	Lectur	_	_														
		actor's lecture			3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
		erial presente es contribute t		xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1564 1/1559	5.00 5.00	4.53	4.28	4.20	5.00 5.00
				you learned our understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2		4.33	,		4.57			4.33
J. Dia aa	.010115001	ceeminques en	nance y	our underscanding	5	O	Ü	O	O	4	_	1.55	137/1332	1.33	1, 11	3.50	3.00	1.55
		Discus			_					•	_					4 00		****
				what you learned d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1384 ****/1382		4.37	4.08	3.86 4.03	****
				d to participate d open discussion	5 5	0	0	0	0	0			****/1368		4.55	4.29	4.03	****
J. Dia cii	e mscruc	cor encourage	IAII AII	a open arscassion	5	U	U	U	U	U	1	3.00	/1300		1.33	4.50	4.01	
		Labora	-															
5. Were r	equiremer	nts for lab rep	orts cl	early specified	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	4.00
	_	Field			_													
5. Did co	nierences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.51	****
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	jor		0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0		0.	1					0	respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				5 0 I 0		Ot.	her					2						
				? U														

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

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1180 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
---------	--------	--------------------	---------------

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	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

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193I 0101 University of Maryland FLUTE Baltimore County

0

Ρ

I 0

Page 1181 Title FEB 11, 2009 Instructor: CELLA, LISA Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	-anei	ncies			Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
		Genera	 l															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.62	4.28	4.11	4.50
		ctor make clear			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	2															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	s 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 th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	cture mat	erial presented	d and e	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 th	e lecture	es 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 au	diovisual	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	5.00
		Field V	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry	y out i	field activities	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	291/ 312	2.00	3.77	3.68	3.51	2.00
		Self 1	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ate 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 y	our conta	acts with the in	nstruct	or helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.80	4.43	4.27	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	A 1		Red	anir	 -d f	or Ma	iors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		100	datt	- Lu I	) I Ma	JOIL	,	0	Graduat	_	J	ria je		_
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0				Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	-major	1	
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0			GCIICIAI					3				_						
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0				Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a		enoug	ŗh		

Other

1

responses to be significant

Course-Section	n: MUSC 193U 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1182
Title	HARP	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	POLITATIF TACOUR	Fall 2008	Joh TRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

11010	IIIICI	Darcinor	c country	100 11, 2
Instructor:	POLLAUF, JACQUE	Fall	2008	Job IRBR3
Enrollment:	1			

Questionnaires: 1

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	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

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

University of Maryland Page 1183
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: MUSC 193V 0101

2

ELECTRIC BASS

BALDWIN, THOMAS

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

								Inst	tructor	Dept UMBC Level			Sect			
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fr	om 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 instructo	or make clear the e	xpected 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 ques	stions 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 evaluat	cions reflect the e	xpected 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				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	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	3.86	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained				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	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	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	or'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 instructo			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture mater		_	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				0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.14	5.00
or more requirements for tab reports oredrin specifical																
Frequ				Dist	tribu	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193W 0201 University of Maryland
Title UPRIGHT BASS Baltimore County
Instructor: PUAS LAURA Fall 2008

Instructor: RUAS, LAURA Fall 2008
Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires:	1	Student Cou	ourse I	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	1	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	3.78	3.68	3.54	5.00

Page 1184

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Sectio	n: MUSC 194A 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1185
Title	PIANO	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	EDVINAL IN DVCRE	E-11 2009	Tob TDDD2020

Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires:	1	Student Course	Fralustion	Ougetionnaire
Ouest Tomatres.	1	Student Course	Evaluation	Ouest Tommatie

	Frequencies						Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	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

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

Course-Section	n: MUSC 194A 0201	University of Maryland	Page 1186
Title	PIANO	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	HAMILV THOMAC	Fall 2008	TOP TEEDSUS

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		-	•	_
Title	PIANO	Baltimore (	County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	HAWLEY, THOMAS	Fall	2008	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	1			

Questionnaires: 1

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

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 194F 0101 Page 1187 Title GUITAR FEB 11, 2009 Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 6

Ctudont	Collecto	Trraliiation	Ouestionnaire
bludent	COULSE	Evaluation	Oneprioring

Questionnaires: 3

	Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		ept UMBC Level		Sect						
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 L															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls 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 th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.58	4.23	4.16	4.33
3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.62	4.27	4.10	4.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	1		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	
		_		what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512		4.32	4.10	3.86	5.00
		g system clearly		ned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.67
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1340/1646	4.33	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	3.96	5.00
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well r	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	
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.53	4.28	4.20	4.67
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	512/1559	4.67	4.57	4.29	4.20	4.67
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.41	3.98	3.86	4.00
		Discus	zion															
1 Did cl	ass discu			hat you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	3.86	5.00
				to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1382		4.65	4.29	4.03	5.00
				l open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	0		948/1368		4.55	4.30	4.01	4.00
		chniques succes		c open arroadren	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	431/ 948		4.52	3.95	3.75	4.00
				_		- '	,											
				Frequ	iency	DIS	trib	1110	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	auire	ed f	or Ma	iors	 5	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0						,	-	-			-	) 0		=
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									5				3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	0 Electives 0 #### - Means them			here a	re not	enoue	rh							
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Ot:	her					1	-		3			
				? 0														

Course-Section:	MUSC 194I 0201	University of	of Maryland	Page 1188
Title	FLUTE	Baltimore	e County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	KESNER, LORI	Fall	2008	Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

IICIE	FLUIE	Baltimore	Country	FED	Т.Т
Instructor:	KESNER, LORI	Fall	2008	Job	IR
Enrollment:	1				

Questionnaires: 1

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	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
Proces	Fina minanana Di atuributian													

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 194Y 0101	University of	f Maryland	Page 1189
Title	IMPROV	Baltimore	County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	BELZER, MATTHEW	Fall	2008	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	1			

Questionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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
Frequ	iency	Dist	cribu	ıtior	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
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	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 210 0101

MUSICIANSHIP LAB III

Title Instructor: CELLA, LISA

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 16

## Baltimore County Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Page 1190 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

		Question	ıs		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	w insights,ski	.lls fro	om 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 th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	6	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	702/1648	4.63	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.40
		estions reflec			6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	166/1375	4.95	4.62	4.27	4.37	4.90
		ations reflect			6	1	0	0	2	1		4.44	580/1595		4.53	4.20	4.22	4.44
				what you learned	6	5	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1533		4.34	4.04	4.04	5.00
				to what you learned	6	6	0	1	0	0		4.25	687/1512		4.32	4.10		4.25
		g system clearl		ained	6	0	1	0	0	2		4.40	635/1623	4.55	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.40
	-	was class cano			6	0	0	0	0	4			1103/1646		4.55	4.69	4.63	
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ill tead	ching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	483/1621	4.56	4.43	4.06	4.01	4.43
		Lectur	·e															
		actor's lecture			12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.50
		ctor seem inter			12	0	0	0	0	1			931/1572		4.84	4.70	4.73	4.75
				explained clearly	12	0	0	1	0	0			939/1564		4.53	4.28	4.27	4.25
4. Did th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1370/1559	3.50	4.57	4.29	4.33	3.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass discu			what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.99	****
				ed to participate	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.19	****
		_	_	nd open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1368	***	4.55	4.30	4.21	****
		Labora	torv															
5. Were r	requiremen		_	learly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.33	***
		Semina	ır															
5. Were o	criteria f	or grading mad	le clear	<u>-</u>	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 288	3.80	3.78	3.68	3.65	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	onferences	help you carr	y out i	field activities	12	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	217/ 312	3.75	3.77	3.68	3.59	3.50
		Self																
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors fo	or all t	the students	14	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.72	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	1	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 4		Red	auir	 ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		100	-1011	- L	J_ 110	. , 🗆	~	•	STAGAGE	_	•	11000	-	J
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									5				3 - 1	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					8						

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

			Erc	miar	cies			Inct	ructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	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		****/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		****/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		****/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 /	0	0	^	0	^	4	F 00	++++ /1 <b>2 0 1</b>	****	4 27	4 00	2 00	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.99	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14		0	-	0	0	4		****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.19	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/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		****/ 243	****	2.67	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.33	****
			-	-	-	_	_		, 555					
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		****/ 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		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 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
0.16 7 1														
Self Paced	1.0	0	0	•	0	0	•	F 00		and and	4 50	4 26	4 05	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 53	****	4.78	4.30	4.07	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 30	****	5.00	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 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

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	h
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_		-	
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 217 0101

ROCK & RELATED MUSIC

Title

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	NR	NT7	Fre	eque:	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Questions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	25	0	0	7	14	43	46		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 2	1 5	1 6	14 15	13	27	4.14	956/1595	4.14	4.53	4.20	4.22	4.14
<ol> <li>Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Did written assignments contribute to what you learned</li> </ol>	24 24	∠ 75	2	1	12	32 5	51 16	4.08	761/1533 1035/1512	4.08 3.89	4.34 4.32	4.04	4.04 4.14	4.08 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	4.14	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	23	3	0	1	3		100			4.87	4.55	4.69		4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	41	4	1	2	29	40	18		1151/1621	3.80	4.43	4.06		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										0.65	4 05	4 00		0 45
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	63	0	8 4	8	12	16	28		1011/1384	3.67	4.37	4.08	3.99	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	64	0	4 5	6 5	14 10	17	30		1038/1382	3.89	4.65	4.29	4.19	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	64 62	46	5 5	5 1	10	18 4	33 11	3.97	973/1368 ****/ 948	3.97 ****	4.55 4.52	4.30	4.21 3.89	3.97 ****
4. Were special techniques successful	02	40	5	_	O	-1	11	3.30	7 940		4.32	3.93	3.09	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	125	9	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 221	****	5.00	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information		0	1	0	3	0	2		, -	****	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	****
<ol> <li>Did the lab instructor provide assistance</li> <li>Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified</li> </ol>	127 100	7 7	0 2	1 2	0 5	0	0 19		****/ 209 ****/ 555	****	4.80	4.35 4.29	4.64 4.33	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	100	,	۷	4	5	U	19	4.14	/ 555		4.00	4.23	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		,	***	5.00	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	126 127	5 5	0	1 0	0 1	0	3 2	4.25	****/ 81 ****/ 92	****	5.00 5.00	4.43	3.67 5.00	****
<ol> <li>Did presentations contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were criteria for grading made clear</li> </ol>	108	5 6	2	5	2	10	2		****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	100	0	۷	5	2	10	2	3.24	/ 200		3.70	3.00	3.03	
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 99	6 6	0 1	0 6	1	0 21	1		****/ 39 ****/ 312	****	5.00	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	99	ь	Т	ь	U	21	2	3.5/	^^^^/ 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			****	4.80	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

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	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 enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 218 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County RECORDING TECHNIQUES

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

0

0

3.00-3.49 0

3.50-4.00 1

D 0 F 0

I 0

0

1

Questionnaires: 10

14

Page 1193

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Title Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID Fall 2008

								_	ncie				ructor	Course	_			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did s	vou gain n	new insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.62	4.28	4.29	4.60
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	556/1648		4.58	4.23	4.25	4.50
		mestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	370/1375		4.62	4.27	4.37	
		uations reflect		-	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	636/1595		4.53	4.20	4.22	4.40
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	545/1533		4.34	4.04	4.04	
	-	-		to what you learne	0 b	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	627/1512		4.32	4.10	4.14	4.30
		ng system clearl			0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	635/1623		4.32	4.16	4.21	4.40
		was class canc			0	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1148/1646		4.55	4.69	4.63	4.56
				ching effectivenes	s 0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	288/1621	4.60		4.06	4.01	4.60
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.50
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	840/1572		4.84	4.70	4.73	4.80
				explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	7		550/1564		4.53	4.28	4.27	4.60
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	695/1559		4.57	4.29	4.33	
				your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	188/1352		4.41			4.70
		Discus	gion															
1. Did o	class disc			what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.99	****
				ed to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.19	****
		-	_	nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	0		****/1368		4.55	4.30	4.21	****
		echniques succe			8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.89	****
		Labora	torv															
5. Were	requireme		-	learly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	***	4.80	4.29	4.33	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did 0	conference			field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.59	****
				Fre	quenc	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Q-1-1-1-1	B	G 27.7		Demonstration 1				_					_				25-2	
Credits	≝arneα 	Cum. GPA	· · – – – – – ·	Expected Grade	S 			ке:	ason:	5 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	\$	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	9
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	1

Electives

Other

0

5

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: MUSC 221 0101 University of Maryland Title JAZZ THRY AND AURAL SK

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1194

			Fre	eanei	ncies	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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		4.58	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														

### Frequency Distribution

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 \*\*\*\*

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	В	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	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did vo	u gain no	General w insights,skil		m this sourse	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	306/1649	4.78	4.62	4.28	4.29	4.78
		tor make clear			4	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.76	498/1648	4.76	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.76
		estions reflect	_		4	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44		4.44	4.62	4.27	4.37	4.44
		ations reflect			4	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.53	4.20	4.22	4.67
				what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	2		4.75	180/1533	4.75	4.34	4.04		4.75
				what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63		4.63	4.32	4.10		4.63
		system clearly			4	0	1	0	1	1	-	4.22	849/1623	4.22	4.32	4.16		4.22
		was class cance	_	inea	4	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.63	
				ning effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	0			191/1621					
				J														
		Lecture			_													
		ctor's lectures			7	0	1	0	0	2	3		1279/1568	4.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.00
		tor seem intere			7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84		4.73	5.00
		_		xplained clearly	-7	0	1	0	0	0		4.33	854/1564	4.33	4.53	4.28	4.27	
		s contribute to			7	0	0	0	0 1	1	5	4.83	- ,	4.83	4.57	4.29		4.83
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enr	nance yo	our understanding	8	0	U	0	Τ	0	4	4.60	247/1352	4.60	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.60
		Discuss	ri on															
1 Did al:	ace diecu			what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5 00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.99	****
				d to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.19	****
		_	_	d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.21	****
		chniques succes		a open arbeassion	11	1	0	0	0	0			****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	3.89	****
i. were bi	poolal oc	omitages seeded	20141			_	ŭ	ŭ	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, , , , ,		1.52	3.75	3.03	
		Laborat	cory															
5. Were re	equiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cle	early 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 c	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.65	****
		m: -1.1 n	1															
E Did go	nforongog	Field W		iold patirition	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4 00	2 77	2 60	3.59	4 00
5. Dia coi	nrerences	help you carry	out 1.	ieid activities	9	U	U	U	U	4	U	4.00	08/ 312	4.00	3.//	3.08	3.59	4.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	ı									
				_														
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 3		Red	mir	ed fo	or Ma	iors		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2						. ,		_	or addac.	-	-			ŭ
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	3	Non-	major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									5	_			3	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					3	_		_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 224 0101

Title INSTRUMENTATION Instructor: MACAULAY, JANIC

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13

Page 1195 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Course-Section: MUSC 225 0101 University of Maryland Title THEORY III: COUNTERPOIN Baltimore County

Instructor: TRIPPROBERSON,

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1196

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Questions				NR	NA		_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did vo	ou gain n		_	m this course	2	0	0	0	Ο	3	2	4.40	776/1649	4.48	4.62	4.28	4.29	4.40
_	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals							0	0	3	2	4.40	702/1648		4.58	4.23	4.25	4.40
		uestions reflec			2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1375		4.62	4.27	4.37	4.60
		uations reflect			2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60			4.53	4.20	4.22	4.60
				what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	,			4.04	4.04	4.50
	_	-		to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3		310/1512			4.10	4.14	4.60
		g system clearl		2	2	0	0	0	0	2	-		395/1623			4.16	4.21	
		was class cand			2	0	0	0	0	4			1440/1646		4.55	4.69	4.63	4.20
				hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	1			1261/1621			4.06		3.67
J. 110W WC	Jara Joa	grade the overa	11 0000	ming circectveness	-	Ü	Ü	_	Ü	-	_	3.07	1201/1021	3.50	1.15	1.00	1.01	3.07
		Lectur	e															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							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						0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1572		4.84	4.70	4.73	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	0			****/1564		4.53	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0			****/1559		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	****
	1,																	
	Seminar																	
5. Were c	criteria	for grading mad	e clear		5	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	253/ 288	2.50	3.78	3.68	3.65	2.50
		3 3																
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	onference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	4	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	239/ 312	3.53	3.77	3.68	3.59	3.33
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 3		Re	auir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1						,		-		-	-	) (	-	=
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									5				3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	rh
	-			P 0		_							respons				_	•
				I O		Other						3			5-			
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 225 0201

Title THEORY III: COUNTERPOIN

Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 25

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1197 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Questions			NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	 L															
1. Did you	gain new	insights,ski	lls from	m 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	instruct	or make clear	the exp	pected 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	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1375	4.80	4.62	4.27	4.37	5.00
4. Did othe	er evalua	tions reflect	the exp	pected goals	8	4	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	227/1595	4.68	4.53	4.20	4.22	4.77
5. Did assi	gned rea	dings contrib	ate to 1	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 writ	ten assi	gnments contri	ibute 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	y expla:	ined	8	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	541/1623	4.54	4.32	4.16	4.21	4.47
-		as class cance			7	0	0	0	10	7	1		1630/1646		4.55	4.69	4.63	3.50
9. How woul	.d you gr	ade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	10	1	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	812/1621	3.90	4.43	4.06	4.01	4.14
		Lecture	<b>e</b>															
1. Were the	instruc	tor's lectures	s well p	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	instruct	or seem inter	ested in	n the subject	17	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.73	5.00
				xplained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	406/1564	4.71	4.53	4.28	4.27	4.71
		contribute to		-	17	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.57	4.29	4.33	4.75
5. Did audi	ovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	18	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	495/1352	4.29	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.29
		Discus	sion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	3.99	****
2. Were all	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate							0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.19	****
3. Did the	instruct	or encourage :	fair and	d 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	***
		Semina	r															
1. Were ass	signed to	pics relevant	to the	announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the	instruct	or available :	for ind	ividual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.47	3.33	****
				what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	3.67	****
_		s contribute		you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92		5.00	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were cri	teria fo	er grading made	e clear		21	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 288	2.50	3.78	3.68	3.65	****
		Field W	Work															
5. Did conf	erences	help you carry	y out f	ield activities	14	0	0	2	0	8	1	3.73	198/ 312	3.53	3.77	3.68	3.59	3.73
		Self 1	Paced															
5. Were the	ere enoug	h proctors for	r all th	ne students	23	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	3.72	***
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utio	n									
G 11. 5	1	a an		- 101				_					_					
Credits Ear	nea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				ке 	asons	3 			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6		Rec	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 7			_											-
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	25	Non-	major	9
84-150 Grad.	3 0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	3 8	D 1 F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - :	Means there a		re not	enoua	h
		· · · · · · · ·	-	P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Oth	ner				1	4	<u> </u>					
				2 0		361161												

0

Course-Section: MUSC 227 0101 Title

University of Maryland THRY V:20TH CENT MUS A Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: VOLAJ, ALTIN

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1198 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

							LTC	rrequencies		5		TIID	LIUCLUI	COULSE	Debr	Jept UMBC		Secr
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did you	cain ne	w insights,skil		this course	3	0	1	2	1	2	9	4 07	1142/1649	4 07	4 62	4.28	4.29	4.07
		tor make clear			3	0	1	0	2	5	7		1032/1648	4.13	4.58	4.23	4.25	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						0	0	0	1	0	13		199/1375			4.27		
		ations reflect			3	2	0	2	0	3	8		759/1595	4.31	4.53	4.20	4.22	4.31
5. Did ass:	igned rea	adings contribu	ite to wi	nat 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 writ	tten ass	ignments contri	bute 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
		system clearly		ned	3	0	1	0	1	6	7	4.20	883/1623			4.16	4.21	4.20
		was class cance			3	0	0	0	0	2			731/1646	4.87			4.63	
9. How would	ld you g	rade the overal	.l teach:	ing effectiveness	7	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1281/1621	3.64	4.43	4.06	4.01	3.64
		Lecture	2															
1. Were the	e instru	ctor's lectures		repared	5	0	1	2	1	0	9	4.08	1248/1568	4.08	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.08
		tor seem intere	_	-	5	0	0	0	0	2	11		740/1572	4.85	4.84	4.70	4.73	4.85
				plained clearly	5	0	1	1	4	2			1324/1564		4.53		4.27	3.69
4. Did the	lecture	s contribute to	what yo	ou learned	5	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	931/1559	4.31	4.57	4.29	4.33	4.31
5. Did aud:	iovisual	techniques enh	nance you	ur understanding	5	3	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	950/1352	3.70	4.41	3.98	4.07	3.70
		Discuss							_	_	_		001/1004		4 0 -			
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					12	0	1	0	1	1			921/1384				3.99	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					12	0	1 1	0	0	1			887/1382	4.17		4.29	4.19	4.17
		tor encourage i chniques succes		open discussion	12 13	3	1	1	1	0 1	0		1181/1368 ****/ 948	3.50 ***		4.30	4.21 3.89	3.50 ***
4. Were spe	eciai te	cimiques succes	SSLUI		13	3	1	U	U	1	U	2.50	"""/ 940		4.52	3.95	3.09	
		Laborat	ory															
5. Were red	quiremen	ts for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.33	****
		a .																
E Word ar	itorio f	Seminar or grading made			15	0	0	1	0	1	1	2 67	****/ 288	****	2 70	2 60	2 65	****
5. Were Cr.	ILEIIA I	or grading made	clear		13	U	U	_	U			3.07	200		3.70	3.00	3.03	
		Field V	Jork															
5. Did cont	ferences	help you carry	out fie	eld activities	13	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.59	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ear	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Тур	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 11		Re	 quire	 -d fo	or M	aior:		0	Graduate		0	Majo	 r	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		110	-10	Ju	O	w)01			OZ dadao.	_		1100 ) 0	-	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ge	nera:	L				1	Under-gr	rad 1	8	Non-	major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0									5				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		El	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0						Other 12												
				? 2														

Course-Section: MUSC 230 0101
Title MUSICS OF THE WORLD

MUSICS OF THE WORLD Baltimore County BECK, GINA C Fall 2008

I 0

Instructor: BECK, GINA C

Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 42

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 1199 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Questions			NR	NA	Fr 1	equei 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
	1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course							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							3	5	12	4.33	797/1648		4.58	4.23	4.25	4.33
	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							2	3	15	4.52			4.62	4.27	4.37	4.52
		ations reflect th		21	13	0	0	1	0	7		****/1595		4.53	4.20	4.22	****
	_	-	to what you learned	21	3	5	2	1	5	5		1400/1533		4.34	4.04	4.04	3.17 ****
		gignments contributed system clearly e	ite to what you learned	21 21	14 0	0	0	0 4	2 1	5 16		****/1512 427/1623		4.32	4.10 4.16	4.14 4.21	4.57
		was class cancell		21	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95			4.55	4.16		4.95
			teaching effectiveness	27	0	0	1	3	7			1016/1621				4.01	
J. 110W WO	ara you g	rade the overall	cadining critectiveness	2,	J	Ü	-	3	,	-	3.75	1010/1021	3.75	1.15	1.00	1.01	3.75
		Lecture		22	0			_	_								
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	1	5	14	4.65			4.59	4.43	4.39	4.65
				22	0	0 1	0	0	5 5	15	4.75	, -		4.84	4.70	4.73	4.75
		erial presented a es contribute to w	and explained clearly	22 22	0	0	1	2	1	12 16	4.35			4.53 4.57	4.28	4.27	4.35 4.60
			nce your understanding	22	0	1	0	3	2	14	4.40			4.41	3.98		4.40
J. Did au	alovisuai	ceciniiques einiai	ice your understanding	22	U		U	3	2	11	1.10	377/1332	1.10	1.11	3.70	4.07	1.10
		Discussio		31	0												
	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					3	1	2	3	2		1254/1384		4.37	4.08	3.99	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	1	1	3	2	4		1160/1382			4.29	4.19	3.64
		chniques successf	-	31 31	0 7	2	1	1	2	5		1136/1368 ****/ 948		4.55 4.52	4.30	4.21 3.89	3.64 ****
4. Were Sp	peciai te	cimiques successi	-UI	31	,	U	U	U	3	1	4.25	"""/ 940		4.52	3.95	3.09	
		Laborator	-														
5. Were re	equiremen	its for lab report	s clearly specified	36	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.33	****
		Seminar															
5. Were ci	riteria f	or grading made of	clear	25	0	0	2	1	13	1	3.76	171/ 288	3.76	3.78	3.68	3.65	3.76
		Field Wor	rk														
1. Did fie	eld exper		to what you learned	41	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	3.00	4.06	3.93	****
			out field activities	29	0	0	2	0	10	1	3.77	191/ 312	3.77	3.77	3.68	3.59	3.77
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trıb	utioi	n									
Credits Ea				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	3			
00-27	 0	0.00-0.99	 ) A 12		 Ra		ed fo	 эт М	 a ior	 -a 1	n	 Graduat		0	Majo		5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99			1/6	quit.	cu I	١٠١٠ ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	۱۰۲ م	. J	. •	Graduat	_	J	Majo	<i>)</i> <u> </u>	J
56-83	2	2.00-2.99			Ge	nera	1				3	Under-q	rad 4	2	Non-	-major	37
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	·			2_4					-					5	= -
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	5 F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
Р 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
I O Othor								e									

Other

6

Course-Section: MUSC 261 0101

TEACHING CHORAL SINGIN

Title

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

			Fre	Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC Level		Sect	
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		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		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			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			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			1451/1621		4.43		4.01	
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		4.53	4.28	4.27	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	0			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			****/1352	****	4.41		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		****/ 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	_	0	•	0	0	•	-	F 00		ale ale ale al	4 50	4 20	4 05	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 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

Credits E	Carned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101 University of Maryland
Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS Baltimore County

Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 14

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

3

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

Fall 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1201

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
a1														
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	4.23	4.18	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375		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		4.53	4.20	4.21	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	0	0	0	3		****/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		4.32	4.10	4.11	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	169/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	2	2	6		1287/1646		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	- ,		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
Freq	uency	7 Dist	tribu	ıtioı	า									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Por	asons	-			Ty	20			Majors	
creatts Larned cum. GPA Expected Grades				350118	5 				 be			s		
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8			quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	7
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 0														
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 0			nera:	L				3	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	major	7
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0														
		_									_			_

Electives

Other

0

6

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101 University of Maryland CHAMBERS PLAYERS Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Title

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 19 Ouestionnaires: 14

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Page 1202

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean Ouestions 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 4.607. 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  $8 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 3 \ 2 \ 4.17 \ 789/1621 \ 4.40 \ 4.43 \ 4.06 \ 4.02 \ 4.40$ 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 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 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

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	d 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	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				2	Ο						

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			Fre	equer 2	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
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		770/1648		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		4.53	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		****/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		4.32	4.16	4.08	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	664/1646		4.55	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	0.5	0	-	0	0		2	4 00	**** (1560	ale ale ale ale	4 50	4 42	4 20	****
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	Ţ	0	0	4	3		****/1568	****	4.59	4.43	4.39	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1572		4.84	4.70	4.64	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	27	0	1	0	0	1	4		****/1564	****	4.53	4.28	4.25	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	0 6	0	0	0	1	5		****/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	Ο	3 75	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	0	2	2		****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	1	0	2	1		****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were special techniques successful	31	0	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	4.00	****
1. Note Special Commiques Successful	-	ŭ	Ü	ŭ	_	_	Ū	3.30	, , , , ,		1132	3.75	1.00	
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	****
-1.11														
Field Work					_	•	•					4 0 -		
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 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														
. Were there enough proctors for all the students		1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****
5. Here there enough proceeds for all the students	31	_	J	0	0	_	J	1.00	, 110		1.00	5.77	1.05	
Emogra	0000	Diat	- m i bı	.+ : .~										

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 304 0101

UMBC JUBILEE SINGERS

Questions

Title JACKSON, JANICE Instructor:

Enrollment: 46 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1204 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

		 Cenera	1															
1. Did you	General  Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  Did the instructor make clear the expected goals							0	0	1	11	4.92	167/1649	4.92	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.92
_	_	-			33	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.67
3. Did the	e exam qı	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	33	2	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	****/1375	****	4.62	4.27	4.22	****
		uations reflect		_	33	0	1	0	0	3	8		622/1595		4.53	4.20		4.42
				what you learned	33	4	0	0	0	0			****/1533	****		4.04	4.05	****
				o what you learned		5	0	0	0	2			****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	4.11	****
		g system clearl		ined	33	2	1	0	0	2	7		****/1623	****	4.32	4.16	4.08	****
		was class canc			33	0	0	0	0	_	10		782/1646		4.55	4.69		4.83
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	35	4	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1621	****	4.43	4.06	4.02	****
		Lectur	е															
		actor's lecture			39	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1568	****	4.59	4.43	4.39	****
		ctor seem inter			39	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1572	****	4.84	4.70	4.64	****
				xplained clearly	39	0	0	0	1	0			****/1564	****	4.53	4.28	4.25	****
		es contribute t			39	1	0	0	0	0			****/1559	****	4.57	4.29	4.23	****
5. Did aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	40	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.97	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	4.11	****	
2. Were al	Were all students actively encouraged to participat							0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.37	****
3. Did the	. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		43	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	4.00	****
E Wome me	o 1 o o	Labora	_	early specified	36	0	1	0	1	0	7	1 22	****/ 555	****	4 00	4 20	4 22	****
5. Were re	edarremer	its for lab rep	OILS CI	early specified	30	U		U	1	U	,	4.33	/ 555		4.00	4.29	4.22	
F		Semina			4.0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0 00	****		2 50	2 60	2 50	ale ale ale ale
5. Were ci	riteria i	for grading mad	e clear		40	0	0	3	0	2	0	2.80	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.58	****
		Field																
5. Did cor	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	40	0	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.60	***
		Self	Paced															
5. Were th	here enou	ugh proctors fo	r all t	he students	44	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Тур	e e			Majors	l
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11											0	Graduate		0	Majo		1
	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0					re(	4ull.	EU I	or Ma	TOUR	>	J	Graduale		J	ria JC	,T	Т
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 1 C 0					Cer	nera:	1				5	Under-gr	ad 4	15	Non-	major	44
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		Gel	icia.	_				J	onder -gr	.uu -	1.5	11011-	iiia jul	77
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					E14	act i t	ves.				1	#### - N	leans t	here :	re not	enous	rh
JI da.	P 0					Electives									nere s		_	11
	I 0					Other					1	response		JC DIGI				
	? 0											_						

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

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  7. Was the grading system clearly explained  8. How many times was class cancelled  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 2 2 3 2 0 0	0 0 35 32 34 38 13 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 1 1 0 1 1 1 0	4 6 1 1 0 5 0	41 38 6 10 6 4 26 45 44	4.82 4.63 4.91 4.63 4.60	167/1649 202/1648 ****/1375 ****/1595 ****/1533 ****/1512 189/1623 1/1646 28/1621	4.91 4.82 *** *** *** 4.78 5.00 4.98	4.62 4.58 4.62 4.53 4.34 4.32 4.32 4.32	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.27 4.18 4.22 4.21 4.05 4.11 4.08 4.67 4.02	4.91 4.82 **** **** **** 4.78 5.00 4.98
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25 21 25 24 21	0 0 0 0 5	0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 3	0 0 1 0 0	20 24 19 20 15	5.00 5.00 4.95 4.90 4.47	1/1568 1/1572 101/1564 205/1559 331/1352	4.95 4.90 4.47	4.59 4.84 4.53 4.57 4.41	4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98	4.39 4.64 4.25 4.23 3.97	5.00 5.00 4.95 4.90 4.47
<ol> <li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li> <li>Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion</li> <li>Were special techniques successful</li> </ol>	33 34 33	0 0 4	0 0	0 0	0 0 0	2 2 1	10 9 7	4.83 4.82	312/1382 ****/1368 ****/ 948	4.83	4.65 4.55 4.52	4.29 4.30 3.95	4.37 4.39 4.00	4.83
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34 36	0	2	0	3	0	6		****/ 555 ****/ 288			4.29	4.22	****
Field Work  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  Self Paced	34	0	0	1	0	9			****/ 312					***
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	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	es Reasons								Туј	pe 			Majors	
00-27 5 0.00-0.99 0 A 40 28-55 6 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 6 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 84-150 4 3.00-3.49 2 D 0			quire nera:		or Ma	jor		0 6	Graduate Under-g		0	Majo Non-	or major	20 25
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 15 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0	Electives 7 Other 19						#### - Means there a responses to be sign				_	h		

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

LAGANA, THOMAS Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Title

Instructor:

Course-Section: MUSC 307A 0101

SMALL ENSEMBLE

Page 1206 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Cou	ırse Evaluation	n Questionnaire
-------------	-----------------	-----------------

Questions			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean		
		General																
1 Did you	gain ne	General w insights,skil	=	this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4 62	4.28	4.27	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00
		estions reflect			0	2	0	0	0	0	1		1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00
		uations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00
		g system clearly			0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00
8. How man	y times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wou	ild you g	grade the overal	l teach	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.67
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	e instru	actor's lectures	well p	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	instruc	ctor seem intere	sted ir	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 lec	ture mat	terial presented	and ex	plained 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	lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.23	5.00
5. Did aud	liovisual	l techniques enh	nance yo	our 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 cla	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned							0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	4.11	5.00
2. Were al	l studer	nts actively end	couraged	l 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	instruc	ctor encourage f	air and	l open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00
		Laborat	-															
2. Were yo	u provid	ded with adequat	e backs	ground 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 as	signed t	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 W																
5. Did con	ferences	s help you carry	out fi	eld activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3						auir		or Ma	iors		0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		100	-1011	- A I	J_ 110	J U L L	-	•	JIAAAAC	_	•	11000	-	-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0											-		5	_
Grad.						Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	1h
P 0				responses to be signif						_	•							
I 0					Ot:	her					2			5-				
? 0																		

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Page 1207 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3		
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course E	valuation Questionnaire

Course-Section: MUSC 307C 0101

SMALL ENSEMBLE

BELZER, MATTHEW

Title

Instructor:

Questions				NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst: Mean	ructor Rank		_	UMBC Mean			
		Genera	_															
_	_	ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to 1	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 wr	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute 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 th	ne grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.02	5.00
		Lectur	_															
1 Wome +	-ho inatm	nanarad	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00		
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1		1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	1		1/15/2		4.53	4.70	4.25	5.00
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1559		4.57		4.23	5.00
				our understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1359		4.41		3.97	
5. Did at	adiovisua.	r techniques em	lance y	our understanding	1	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.90	3.97	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	d 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 th	ne instru	ctor encourage :	fair and	d 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 s	special te	echniques succe	ssful		0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	4.00	5.00
				Frequ	iencs	, Dis	trib	ıtioı	1									
				11040	aciic j	DID	CI ID	20101	•									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	guir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55							-			-						3 -		
56-83						Ge	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	major	2
84-150													3				-	
Grad.						El	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	rh
	-			P 0	BICCCIVCS							respons				_	•	
	I 0				Ot1	her					1			5-				
	? 0						-											

Course-Section:	MUSC 307D 0101	University o	of Maryland	Page 1208
Title	SMALL ENSEMBLE-GUITAR	Baltimore	County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	FORSHEE, ZANE	Fall	2008	Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title	SMALL ENSEMBLE-GUITAR	Baltimore County	F.
Instructor:	FORSHEE, ZANE	Fall 2008	J
Enrollment:	2		

Questionnaires: 1

8. How many times was class cancelled

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

			Fre	eque	ncies	5		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	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

0 0 0

0 0 0 1 5.00

0 0 0 1 5.00

1/1646 5.00 4.55 4.69 4.67 5.00

1/1621 5.00 4.43 4.06 4.02 5.00

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

0

0

0

Ρ I

?

Course-Section: MUSC 307E 0101

SMALL ENSEMBLE

CELLA, LISA

6

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Page 1209 Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

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

							Fre	equei	ncies	\$		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																
1. Did vo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.75
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	263/1648		4.58	4.23	4.18	4.75
		uestions reflect			0	3	0	0	0	0	1		1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	
		uations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	0	2		1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00
				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 wr	itten as	signments contri	bute t	o 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 th	e gradin	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	lled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	l teac	hing 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 t	he instr	uctor's lectures		prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
		ctor seem intere			2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1572				4.64	
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1564			4.28	4.25	5.00
		es contribute to			2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559		4.57		4.23	
				our understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00
		Discuss	ion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	4.37	4.08	4.11	3.00
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00
				d 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 c	riteria :	for grading made			3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	4.00
		Field W	owle															
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry		ield activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00
				Frequ	onat	, Diat	- wib	1+101	2									
				rrequ	rency	DIS	LIDI	10101	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0												_		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				2	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				2	#### - 1				_	rh

Other

University of Maryland Page 1210
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: MUSC 307F 0101

6

SMALL ENSEMBLE

GOLDSTEIN, THOM

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 6

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	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		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		1370/1559	3.50	4.57	4.29	4.23	3.50
Diamondon														
Discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	-	4 00	705 /1204	4 00	4 27	4 00	4 11	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	Ţ	0	Ţ	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	Ţ	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.55	4.30	4.39	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	Τ	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	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
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	ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-	_		
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 307G 0101
Title SMALL ENSEMBLE
Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1211 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fr 1	eque: 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst: Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,skills fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.27	5.00
		ctor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00
		uestions reflect the e		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00
	_	uations reflect the ex	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00
		eadings contribute to		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	4.05	5.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contribute t	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 th	e gradin	g system clearly expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00
8. How ma	ny 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 t	he instr	uctor'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 th	e instru	ctor seem interested i	n 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 le	cture ma	terial presented and e	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 th	e lectur	es 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 au	diovisua	l techniques enhance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00
		Discussion															
		ussions contribute to		0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	4.11	5.00
		nts actively encourage		0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00
		ctor encourage fair ar	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1368	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques 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 y	ou provi	ded with adequate back	ground information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 243	5.00	2.67	4.12	3.89	5.00
		Field Work															
	_	rience contribute to v	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	3.00	4.06	3.59	5.00
		y understand your eval		0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 48	5.00	5.00	4.09	4.21	5.00
		ctor available for cor		0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.43	5.00
		could you discuss you		0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.32	5.00
5. Did co	nierence	s help you carry out i	ield activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 312	5.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	5.00
		Self Paced			•					_		4 / 50		4 50	4 00	4 00	
		system contribute to		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.78	4.30	4.32	5.00
		tions make clear the e		0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.16	4.44	5.00
_		acts with the instruct	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.80	4.43	5.00	5.00
		ck/tutoring by proctor ugh proctors for all t	-	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 24 1/ 110	5.00 5.00	4.89	4.42	5.00 4.05	5.00 5.00
J. WCIC C	ilere eno	agn procedrs for all t						Ü	O	_	3.00	1/ 110	3.00	1.00	3.77	1.05	3.00
			Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 1		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	5 5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	в 0														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0		El	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### -				_	ıh
			P 0									respons	es to k	e sigr	uiican	ıt	
			I 0		Ot!	her					1						

#### Course-Section: MUSC 307I 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 JAZZ GUITAR QUARTET Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: LAGANA, THOMAS

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1212

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om 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 th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.18	5.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	4.05	****
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.08	5.00
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		5	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.67
		Labora	torv															
5. Were r	requireme		-	early specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.22	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading mad	e clear	:	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.58	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2							. – – –	0	 Graduat		0	Majo		3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	A 2 B 0		кес	4urr.	=u 1(	J⊥ IVIč	ajors	•	U	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC	)T	٥
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Cor	nera:	ı				0	Under-q	rad	8	Non-	-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-2.99	0	D 0		GEI	icia.	L				U	onder-9	ıau	U	11011-	ilia JUI	5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		<b>ភ</b> ា 4	ectiv	700				0	#### -	Meane t	here s	are not	enouio	rh
Grau.	U	3.30- <del>1</del> .00	U	P 0		17.7	CCLI	GD 1				U	respons				_	11
				1 0									T Capona	CD CO I	oc bigi	ıııcaı	10	

Other

2

I

0

Course-Section: MUSC 307K 0101 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County

VOCAL ARTS ENSEMBLE Instructor: KING, THOMAS Fall 2008

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

3

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1213 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies		Instructor			Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	•			•		_		4 4 4 6				4 00	4 05	4 40
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5			1116/1649			4.28	4.27	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	,		4.58	4.23		4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	2		401/1375		4.62	4.27		4.67 ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	1		****/1595		4.53	4.20	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	1		****/1533	****	4.34	4.04	4.05	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	1	0	1	2	1		1434/1623		4.32	4.16		3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646		4.55	4.69	4.67	
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		1071/1572		4.84	4.70	4.64	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	1	1		1127/1564		4.53	4.28		4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	_		1322/1559		4.57	4.29		3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/1352		4.41	3.98	3.97	****
o, bia additional commission four andersonnaing	ŭ	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 1332			3.70	3.77	
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	****
T - 1														
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4 E0	293/ 555	4 E0	4 00	4 20	1 22	4 E0
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	О	U	0	U	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
Freq	uency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
	_													
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 7		Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	ior	 s	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	8
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0						,	-	-		-	-	) •		-
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ger	nera	1				2	Under-g	rad 1	0	Non-	major	2
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0		001	LLLU	_				-	onder 9.		~	1,011		
51 155 1 5.00 5.15 0 5		_									_			_

Electives

Other

0

5

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 307L 0101 University of Maryland
Title COLLABORATIVE PIANO Baltimore County
Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE Fall 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

2

University of Maryland Page 1214
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Co	urse Evalu	uation Que	estionnaire
------------	------------	------------	-------------

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

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

Course-Section: MUSC 308 0101 University of Maryland Title UMBC WIND ENSEMBLE

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: VILLANUEVA, JAR Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 19

Page 1215 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

:	19	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain new	w insights,ski		m this course	11	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.75
_	_	tor make clear			12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	475/1648		4.58	4.23	4.18	4.57
		estions reflec		_	12	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1375	****	4.62	4.27	4.22	****
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	12	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1595	****	4.53	4.20	4.21	****
6. Did wr	itten ass:	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	13	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1512	****	4.32	4.10	4.11	****
		system clearl		ined	14	3	0	0	0	0	2		****/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	****
	-	was class canc			15	0	0	0	0	1	3		****/1646		4.55	4.69	4.67	****
9. How wo	uld you gi	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1621	***	4.43	4.06	4.02	****
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1568	****	4.59	4.43	4.39	****
2. Did the	e instruct	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1572	****	4.84	4.70	4.64	****
3. Was le	cture mate	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1564	****	4.53	4.28	4.25	****
4. Did the	e lectures	s contribute t	o what	you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	****	4.57	4.29	4.23	****
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.97	****
		Discus	gion															
1. Did cla	ass discus			what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	4.11	****
				d to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1382	****	4.65	4.29	4.37	****
		_	_	d open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.39	****
4. Were s	pecial ted	chniques succe	ssful		16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	4.00	****
		Labora	torv															
5. Were re	equirement		-	early specified	14	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	323/ 555	4.40	4.80	4.29	4.22	4.40
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading mad			18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.58	***
		Field	Words															
5. Did con	nferences			ield activities	12	0	0	3	0	3	1	3.29	244/ 312	3.29	3.77	3.68	3.60	3.29
5. Were t	here enoug	Self gh proctors fo		he students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****
J. 11010 0	11010 01104	311 P1000012 10	_			Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	ŭ	1.00	, 110		1.00	3.33	1.05	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Rec		 ed fa	or Ma	iore	. – – – !	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 nr	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		1000	1411	_u _ (	)	ت د د د	,		Gradat	_	J	ra J	<i>-</i>	J
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				3	Under-g	rad 1	9	Non-	-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								-	J		-		,	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Oth	ner					0	_		_			
				3 0														

Baltimore County

Page 1216

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: MUSC 311 0101 University of Maryland FREE COMPOSITION SMITH, STUART S Fall 2008

0

Instructor: Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
1 Did 110	u gain ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	m this sourse	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.50
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1648		4.58	4.23	4.18	4.33
		lestions reflec			0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375		4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595		4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00
				what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1533		4.34	4.20	4.05	5.00
				to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512		4.32	4.10	4.11	5.00
		g system clearl		-	0	3	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1623		4.32	4.16	4.11	5.00
				arned	-	0	0	0	0	3			,					
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0					1398/1646		4.55	4.69		4.25
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	II tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	U	U	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.00
		Lectur	_															
		uctor's lecture			3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568		4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
		ctor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
				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 th	ne lecture	es contribute t	o 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 au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute 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 a	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed 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 th	ne instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd 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 s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	-	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	4.00	5.00
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading mad	e clear	<u>:</u>	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 co	nferences			ield activities	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
					-			_					_					
Credits E	larned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5 - – – – -			Ту:	pe 			Majors	; 
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	S	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	<sub>J</sub> h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Otl	her					2						

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

							Fre	equei	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 D:4		General n new insights,skil		thia anyman	5	0	0	0	Λ	1	5	4.83	247/1649	1 02	4.62	1 20	4.27	4.83
		tructor make clear			5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	195/1648	4.83	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.83
		m questions reflect			5	0	0	0	0	2	_	4.67	,	4.67		4.27	4.22	
		waluations reflect	_	-	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.21	5.00
		d readings contribu			5	3	0	0	0	1		4.67			4.34	4.04	4.05	4.67
		assignments contri			5	2	0	0	1	0	3		380/1512		4.32	4.10	4.11	4.50
		ding system clearly			5	0	0	0	0	2			321/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	4.67
		mes was class cance			5	1	0	0	0	1			833/1646	4.80	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.80
	-	ou grade the overal		ng effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	0			****/1621			4.06		****
				<b>J</b>									,					
		Lecture	_															
		structor's lectures	_	-	7	0	0	0	0	1	3		480/1568	4.75	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.75
		tructor seem intere			7	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1572	5.00		4.70	4.64	5.00
		material presented			7	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	342/1564		4.53			4.75
		tures contribute to	_		7	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.57		4.23	
5. Did	audiovi	sual techniques enh	nance you	r understanding	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.41	3.98	3.97	5.00
1 5'1		Discuss			_	0	0	•	0	-		4 00	001/1204	4 00	4 25	4 00	4 11	4 00
		iscussions contribu			6	0	0	0	0	1		4.80	. ,		4.37	4.08	4.11	4.80
		udents actively end			6	0	0	0	0	1			342/1382		4.65	4.29	4.37	4.80
		tructor encourage f l techniques succes		open discussion	6 6	0 2	0	0	0	0 1		5.00	1/1368 152/ 948	5.00	4.55	4.30	4.39	
4. Wel	e specia	i tecimiques succes	SSLUL		0	2	U	U	U	1	۷	4.07	152/ 940	4.07	4.52	3.95	4.00	4.07
		Laborat	orv															
5. Wer	e requir	ements for lab repo	-	rlv specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.80	4.29	4.22	****
				2									,					
		Seminar	2															
5. Wer	e criter	ia for grading made	e clear		9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.78	3.68	3.58	****
		Field V																
5. Did	confere	nces help you carry	out fie	ld activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.60	****
				Frequ	onati	Dia	-rih	1+101	2									
				riequ	lency	DIS		ucioi	.1									
Credit	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Tyj	pe			Majors	
00.27	0	0 00 0 00	0	7 4								·			^			
00-27 28-55		0.00-0.99	0	A 4 B 1		ке	quir	ea fo	or Ma	Jors	5	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	)r.	4
28-55 56-83		1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Cos	nera	1				1	IIndon ~	rad 1	.1	Non	maion	7
84-15		3.00-2.99	2	D 0		Gei	iera.	т				Т	Under-g	ıau I	. 1	NOII-	-major	/
Grad.		3.50-4.00	1	Б 0 F 0		ធ1₄	ecti	ves.				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Graa.	U	3.30 1.00	_	P 0		11.0	CI	v CD				J	response					111
				I O		0+1	ner					4	TCDPOID		.c bigi			
				? 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 Co	urse Eval	luation C	Duestionnai	re
------------	-----------	-----------	-------------	----

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  7. Was the grading system clearly explained  8. How many times was class cancelled  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5 5 5 5 6 6 6 5 9	0 0 0 6 0 6 0	0 0 0 0 0 1 0	0 1 0 0 2 4 2 0	3 4 2 5 2 2 1 17 2	6 8 5 5 4 4 9 8	19 15 21 12 19 10 15 2 8	4.37	550/1649 811/1648 391/1375 746/1595 388/1533 1055/1512 671/1623 1640/1646 687/1621	4.57 4.32 4.68 4.32 4.48 3.86 4.37 3.36 4.25	4.62 4.58 4.62 4.53 4.34 4.32 4.32 4.32	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.27 4.18 4.22 4.21 4.05 4.11 4.08 4.67 4.02	
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12 12 12 12 15	0 0 0 0 2	0 0 1 0 1	0 0 1 0 2	1 0 3 4 2	4 1 4 4 4	16 20 12 13 7	4.43 3.88	554/1568 296/1572 1001/1564 804/1559 836/1352	4.71 4.95 4.19 4.43 3.88	4.59 4.84 4.53 4.57 4.41	4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98	4.39 4.64 4.25 4.23 3.97	4.71 4.95 4.19 4.43 3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	25 25 25	0 0 6	1 2 0	1 0 0	1 0 0	1 2 0	4 4 2	3.75 3.75	****/1382 ****/1368 ****/ 948	**** **** ***	4.65 4.55 4.52	4.29 4.30 3.95	4.37 4.39 4.00	* * * * * * * * * * * *
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 555 ****/ 288		4.80	4.29	4.22	5.00
Field Work  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  Self Paced	20	0	0	0	0	13	0		68/ 312					4.00
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	***
Frequ Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	iency	DIST	ribi		n asons				Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 11 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7 56-83 6 2.00-2.99 0 C 2 84-150 6 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 11 F 0		Ger	quire neral	1	 or Ma	 jor		0 0	Graduat Under-g:	- e rad 3	0 3 here a	Majo Non-	r major	23
P 0 ? 0		Oth	ner				2	1	respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0102 University of Maryland Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 5

Page 1219 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

		0 1						_	ncies		_		ructor		Dept		Level	Sect
		Question	s 		NR 	NA	1	2	3 	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	776/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.40
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	702/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.40
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	546/1375	4.17	4.62	4.27	4.22	4.50
4. Did oth	er evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	890/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.20
	_	-		what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	476/1533	4.37	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.40
		_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2		755/1512		4.32	4.10	4.11	4.20
		system clearl		ined	0	0	0	1	0	2		4.00	1029/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	4.00
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2			1103/1646		4.55	4.69	4.67	
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1151/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	3.70
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	e instru	ctor's lecture	s 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	instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n 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 led	ture mat	erial presente	d and e	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	lecture	s contribute t	o 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 aud	liovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1219/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ss discu			what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	795/1384	4.48	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.00
				ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	616/1382		4.65	4.29	4.37	4.50
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	426/1368		4.55	4.30	4.39	4.75
		chniques succe			1	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	645/ 948		4.52	3.95	4.00	3.67
		Labora	torv															
5. Were re	quiremen		-	early specified	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	***
		Field	ToT a sealer															
5. Did con	ferences			ield activities	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	3.89	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00
			_	_														
				Frequ	ency	r Dist	iribu	ıtıor	1									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA	-	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Т	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	 guir	ed fo	or Ma	jors		1	Graduat	 :е	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			_			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				2	Under-	rad	5	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	уh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sigr	ificar	ıt	
													_		-			
				I 0		Oti	ner					3						

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0102 University of Maryland Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: WANENCHAK, LEO (Instr. B) Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 5

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

Page 1220

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Out and the same	<b>.</b>	373		_	ncie		-		ructor	Course	_			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	mean	Mean	mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	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		4.40			4.58	4.23	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1		4.50					4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0		2		4.20						
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1		3	4.40	476/1533					
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2			755/1512				4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2			1029/1623		4.32	4.16		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	1	2			795/1384				4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0				4.50	616/1382	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1		0	0		1			426/1368			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
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	S			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor:	 S	1	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	3

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0103 University of Maryland

Page 1221 Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A) Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 7

Questionnaires: 3 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Overtion	a		NTD	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	_	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	_		Level	
		Question 	5 			NA				<del>-4</del>		меан	Ralik	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	871/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	4.33
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.67
		uestions reflec			0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	4.17	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.33
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o 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	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1623	4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.67
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1037/1646	4.54	4.55	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	914/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	actor's lecture	s 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	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained 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	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	512/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.58
5. Did au	diovisua	our understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1049/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	4.25		
		Discus																
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1		437/1384		4.37	4.08	4.11	4.50
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1382	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00
				d open discussion	1		0	0	0	0	2		1/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	5.00
		Field																
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	3.89	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Major							1	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0												_		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				1	Under-g	rad	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 t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
				I O		Other						0						
				? 0		Other												

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0103 University of Maryland MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE Baltimore County

Page 1222 FEB 11, 2009 Title Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE (Instr. B)

Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires:	3	Student Cour	rse Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

	Questions					NA	Fro	-	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did y	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m 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 t	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	4.67
		uestions reflec			0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	4.17	4.62	4.27	4.22	5.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.33
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1533	4.37	4.34	4.04	4.05	4.67
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.33			4.32	4.10	4.11	4.33
		g system clearl		ined	0	0	0	0	0	1			321/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	4.67
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1			1037/1646		4.55	4.69		4.67
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	914/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.00
		Lectur	_															
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	852/1568			4.43		4.75
		ctor seem inter		3	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1572		4.84	4.70	4.64	5.00
				xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	651/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.58
		es contribute t		-	1	0	0	0	0	1	1		695/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.58
5. Did a	udiovisua	our understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	4.25		
		Discus																
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	437/1384			4.08		4.50
				d to participate	1		0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1382		4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00
				d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were	special te	echniques succe	ssful		1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	5.00
		Field																
5. Did c	onference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	3.89	3.77	3.68	3.60	4.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	guir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 3	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			_									3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons					
				I 0		Other						0	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0104 University of Maryland

MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE

Title Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9 Fall 2008

Baltimore County

Page 1223

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	Conrac	アマアつ	luation	Question	nniro

			Fr	eauer	ncies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		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	l 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			894/1572		4.84		4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.67	, -			4.28	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3		4.22	-,		4.57		4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	2			457/1352					
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	U	U	U	4	Τ	4.33	457/1352	3.//	4.41	3.98	3.97	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4		4.33			4.37	4.08	4.11	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3		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		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	Λ	4 00	****/ 110	****	4 60	3 99	4 05	***
3. Were energy proceeds for all the students	O	O	O	O	Ü	_	Ü	1.00	/ 110		1.00	3.77	1.05	
Freq	uency	/ Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	;			Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 7		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	iors	- – – –	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	7
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1							-	-		-	-	) (		•
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	2
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0		001	c. a	-				•	onder 9.		-	1,011		_
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enona	h
P 0								-	respons				_	
I 0		O+1	her					7	I COP OND					
? 0		0.01						•						

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0104

University of Maryland MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1224 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did yo	u gain new	w insights,skill	s 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 th	e instruct	tor make clear t	he 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 th	e exam que	estions reflect	the expected	d goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1375	4.17	4.62	4.27	4.22	****
		ations reflect t	_	_	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	672/1595	4.21	4.53	4.20	4.21	4.38
	-	adings contribut	_		0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22		4.37		4.04	4.05	4.22
		ignments contrib		you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5		4.13	- , -		4.32	4.10		4.13
		system clearly			0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22		4.20	4.32	4.16	4.08	4.22
		was class cancel			0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	,	4.54		4.69	4.67	4.78
9. How wo	uld you gi	rade the overall	teaching ei	fectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	133/1621	3.96	4.43	4.06	4.02	4.28
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well prepare	ed	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1568	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.61
		tor seem interes			3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	4.82	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.89
		erial presented			3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	234/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.75
		s contribute to			4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559		4.57	4.29		4.61
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enha	nce your und	lerstanding	4	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	457/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	4.33
		Discussi	on															
1. Did cl	ass discus	ssions contribut		ou learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	613/1384	4.48	4.37	4.08	4.11	4.33
		ts actively enco			0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44		4.70	4.65	4.29	4.37	4.44
		tor encourage fa			0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1368	4.90	4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were s	pecial ted	chniques success	ful		0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	****
		Laborato	rv															
5. Were r	equirement	ts for lab repor		specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	****
	-		_	_														
F 1/2		Seminar or grading made	-1		6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	83/ 288	4 00	2 70	2 60	2 50	4 00
5. were c	riceria i	or grading made	clear		О	U	U	U	U	3	U	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.08	3.58	4.00
		Field Wo	rk															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	out field ac	ctivities	3	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	207/ 312	3.89	3.77	3.68	3.60	3.67
		Self Pa	ced															
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors for		lents	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****
				Flag 2		- D-1	lb-		_									
				Frequ	iency	DIS	CLID	ILIOI	1									
Credits E	ected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Тур	e			Majors	3			
00-27	 А 7		Pe	 quir		 วะ M:	aiore		2	Graduate	·	0	Majo		7			
28-55	3 1		0	B 1		re(	dutt (	_u (	J⊥ 1*1¢	יוטר צ	,	4	Graduate	-	J	Ma JO	, <u> </u>	,
56-83	0		0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-gr	ad	9	Non-	major	2
84-150	0		0	D 0			a	_				-	011001 91		-	2.011		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - N	leans t	here a	re not	enoue	1h
	-			P 0									response					•
				I 0		Ot1	her					7	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0106 University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 3

Page 1225

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluat	ion	Question	ınaire
---------	--------	---------	-----	----------	--------

					FΥ	equei	ncies	3		Tngi	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	S			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5		Rank		-		Mean	
1 Did	wou goin n	Genera iew insights,ski		om thia aous	600	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	2	1 67	433/1649	4.14	1 62	4.28	4.27	4.67
		ew insignes,ski ctor make clear				0	0	0	0	1	7	0		1408/1648	4.19	4.58	4.23	4.18	3.67
		mestions reflec				0	2	0	0	1	0	-		1328/1375	4.17	4.62	4.27	4.22	3.00
		uations reflect				0	0	0	1	0	1			1335/1595		4.53	4.20	4.22	3.67
		eadings contrib				0	0	0	0	1	0			545/1533			4.04		4.33
		signments contr				0	0	0	1	0				1170/1512		4.32	4.10		3.67
		g system clearl			rearmed	0	0	0	1	0				1318/1623			4.16	4.11	3.67
	_	s was class canc		aineu		0	0	0	0	0				1037/1646		4.55	4.69	4.67	4.67
		grade the overa		ahina effeat	iveness	0	0	0	0	0	1			234/1621				4.02	
9. HOW	would you	grade the overa	II teat	ching effect	Liveness	U	U	U	U	U	1	2	4.07	234/1021	3.90	4.43	4.00	4.02	4.07
		Lectur	е																
1. Were	e the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.38	4.59	4.43	4.39	4.17
		ctor seem inter			ect	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.82	4.84	4.70	4.64	4.67
3. Was	lecture ma	terial presente	d and	explained cl	learly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	854/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.17
4. Did	the lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	d -	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	512/1559	4.54	4.57	4.29	4.23	4.50
	1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:					0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	690/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	3.75
1 544		Discus				0	0	0	0	_	1	_	4 67	206/1204	4 40	4 27	4 00	4 11	4 67
		ussions contrib				0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384		4.37	4.08	4.11	4.67
		nts actively en				0	0	0	0	0	1		4.67	,			4.29	4.37	4.67
		ctor encourage		nd open disc	cussion	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.67			4.55			4.67
4. Were	e special t	echniques succe	sstul			0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	844/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	3.00
		Labora	torv																
5. Were	e requireme	ents for lab rep	-	learly speci	ified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	5.00
	_	_																	
		Semina																	
5. Were	e criteria	for grading mad	e clear	r		1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	229/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	3.00
Fre							- D:	d la		_									
						lency	Dist	CLID	ucioi	11									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad									Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	 А		Required f							0	Graduat		0	Majo	~~~~~	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	A B	1	Required for Majo				a JOE'S	>	U	Graduat	=	U	Ma JC	)T	2	
28-55 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0		<b>C</b>	2022	1				1	Under-q	wa d	3	Moss	mo i o	1
50-83 94_150	-	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General							Т	onder-g	Lau	3	NOI1-	-major	Τ

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0106 University of Maryland

Enrollment:

5

Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE BELZER, MATTHEW (Instr. B) Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Questionnaires: 3 Student Co	urse	Eval	uati	on Q	uesti	ionna	aire	2						
			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	433/1649	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

Page 1226

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
^		_	^	_	^	_	-	_	4 60 004/1601	2 0 0	4 42	1 0 0	4 00	4 (0

6. How many times was class cancelled	U	U	U	U	U	Τ.		4.07	103//1040	4.54	4.55	4.09	4.07	4.07
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

z. Were air beaucifed accively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	_		1.07	103/1302	1.,0	1.05	1.00	1.5,	1.07	
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

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	Ī
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	_		
					0						

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0112 University of Maryland Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE Baltimore County

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 1
Ouestionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 1227 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1649 4.14 4.62 4.28 4.27 5.00 1. Did you gain new insignts, skills from this course 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 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 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 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 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 1 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 1/1623 4.20 4.32 4.16 4.08 5.00 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 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 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1568 4.38 4.59 4.43 4.39 5.00 1/1572 4.82 4.84 4.70 4.64 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 1.0050/ 52 1.00 3.00 4.06 3.59 1.00 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.001/ 48 5.00 5.00 4.09 4.21 5.00 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons 0.00-0.99 0 A 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 1 00-27 1.00-1.99 0 28-55 0 2.00-2.99 0 56-83 0 0 Under-grad 1 Non-major 0 General 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 D 0 F 0 Electives Ω #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1

? 0

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0112 University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1228

MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE

FEB 11, 2009 Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE (Instr. B) Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 1 Ouestionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 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 1. Did you gain new insignts, skills from this course 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 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 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 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 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 1 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 1/1623 4.20 4.32 4.16 4.08 5.00 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 1 0 4.00 914/1621 3.96 4.43 4.06 4.02 4.00 Lecture

2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 3. Was lecture material presented and overlained 2 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1568 4.38 4.59 4.43 4.39 5.00 1/1572 4.82 4.84 4.70 4.64 5.00 0 0 0 1 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.001/1564 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 1 5.001/ 48 5.00 5.00 4.09 4.21 5.00

## Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0113

MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE

Title Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1229 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

						Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did 10	u gain no	Genera w insights,ski	_	m this sourse	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	2 00	1603/1649	1 11	4.62	4.28	4.27	3.00
		tor make clear			0	0	1	1	0	2	2		1481/1648		4.58	4.23	4.18	3.50
		ations reflect			0	0	0	1	2	1	2		1335/1595		4.53	4.20	4.10	3.67
				what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	2		1180/1533		4.34	4.04	4.05	3.60
				what you learned what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	_	4.00	883/1512			4.10		4.00
		system clearl		_	0	0	0	1	1	3	_		1318/1623		4.32	4.16	4.11	3.67
		was class canc		Inea	0	0	0	0	0	3			1193/1646			4.10		4.50
	-			hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3 4			1261/1621				4.07	
9. HOW WO	uia you g.	rade the overa	II teac.	ning effectiveness	U	U	U	U	2	4	U	3.67	1201/1021	3.90	4.43	4.06	4.02	3.13
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s 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 th	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n 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 le	cture mate	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1564	4.52	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.00
4. Did th	e lecture	s contribute t	o 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 au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1301/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	2.50
1 5 1		Discus				0	0	0	-	-	_	4 40	E 41 /1204	4 40	4 25	4 00	4 11	4 40
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384		4.37	4.08	4.11	4.40
				d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	3		540/1382		4.65	4.29	4.37	4.60
		_		d open discussion	1	0 4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368		4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00 ****
4. were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssiui		Т	4	U	U	1	U	0	3.00	****/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	^ ^ ^ ^
		Labora	torv															
2. Were y	ou provid		-	ground information	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	1.00	2.67	4.12	3.89	****
_		Semina				_				_								
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear		4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences			ield activities	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	3.89	3.77	3.68	3.60	****
			2		_	-	-	_	-	-	-		,					
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors for	r all t	he students	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	***	4.60	3.99	4.05	****
				Frequ	ona	, Diat	-rih	1+101	2									
				riequ	lency	DIS	CLID	16101	.1									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Rec	aui r	ed f	or Ma	aiors	 3	3	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-1~		10		-	-	01 00000	-	-			-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	l				1	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0											-		5 2	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enou	ıh
				P 0									respons					
				I O		Otł	her					1			3			
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 358 0113 Un Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title MUSIC IN PERFORMANCE Baltimore Count Instructor: VILLANUEVA, JAR (Instr. B) Fall 2008

Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1230 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	eane.	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	TIMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		General															
1 Did vo	ou gain ne	00110101	s from this course	0	0	1	Ο	4	0	1	3 00	1603/1649	4.14	4.62	4.28	4.27	3.00
_	_	-	he expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	2		1481/1648		4.58	4.23	4.18	3.50
			he expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	2		1335/1595		4.53	4.20	4.21	3.67
			e to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	2		1180/1533		4.34		4.05	3.60
			ute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	883/1512		4.32	4.10		4.00
		system clearly		0	0	0	1	1	3	_		1318/1623		4.32	4.16	4.08	3.67
		was class cancel	-	0	0	0	0	0	3			1193/1646		4.55	4.69		4.50
	-		teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	0	1	2			1577/1621				4.02	
9. HOW WC	Julu you g	grade the Overall	teaching effectiveness	_	U	4	U		4	U	2.00	15///1021	3.90	4.43	4.00	4.02	3.13
		Lecture															
1. Were t	the instru	actor'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 th	ne instruc	ctor seem interes	ted 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 le	ecture mat	erial 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 th	ne lecture	es 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 au	udiovisual	techniques enha	nce your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1352	3.77	4.41	3.98	3.97	2.50
		-															
		Discussi	~														
			e to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384		4.37	4.08	4.11	4.40
			uraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2		4.60	540/1382		4.65	4.29	4.37	4.60
			ir and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368		4.55	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques success	ful	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	3.89	4.52	3.95	4.00	***
		Laborato:	rv														
2. Were y	you provid		background information	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	1.00	2.67	4.12	3.89	****
		Seminar															
5. Were o	criteria f	for grading made	clear	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.00	3.78	3.68	3.58	****
		Field Wo	rk														
5. Did co	onferences	s 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 Pa	and														
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors for		5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	****
				_		-		-	_	_		,					
			Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0 A 5		Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	aior	 S	3	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	1		0 B 0							-	-	aaaac	-	-	- 100 ) 0		_
56-83	0		0 C 1		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	4
84-150	1		1 D 0								-			-			-
Grad.	0		0 F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ıh.
J	ŭ	3.30 1.00	P 0								_	respons				_	,==
			I 0		O+1	her					1	T CBPOIIS		C Digi	ıııcaı	10	
			? 0		00.						_						
			f U														

Course-Section: MUSC 362 0101 University of Mary
Title ARTS IN EDUCATION Baltimore County
Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI Fall 2008

University of Maryland Page 1231
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	13	
Questionnaires:	13	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions							NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	§ 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 54			General		4.14. d. a.		4	0	0	^	0	1	0	4 00	002/1640	4 00	4 60	4 00	4 07	4 00
			v insights,skil tor make clear				4	0	0	0	1	1 1	8 7	4.89 4.67	203/1649 362/1648	4.89 4.67	4.62 4.58	4.28	4.27 4.18	4.89 4.67
			estions reflect				4	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	212/1375	4.83	4.62	4.23	4.10	4.83
			ations reflect				4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	144/1595	4.89	4.53	4.27	4.22	4.89
			adings contrib			boo	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1533	4.69	4.34	4.20	4.05	4.69
	_		ignments contri		-		4	0	0	0	0	0	9		1/1512	5.00	4.32	4.10	4.11	5.00
			system clearly			irnea	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	448/1623	4.56	4.32	4.16	4.11	4.56
			vas class cance		iiea		6	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1646		4.55	4.16	4.67	5.00
	_		rade the overal		ing offoatiwa	nogg	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1621		4.43			5.00
9. по	w would	you gi	ade the overa.	II teacii	ing effective	eness	5	U	U	U	U	U	0	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.00	4.02	5.00
			Lecture	e																
1. We	re the	instruc	ctor's lectures	s well p	repared		8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Di	d the i	nstruct	or seem intere	ested 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. Wa	s lectu	re mate	erial presented	d and ex	plained clear	rly	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	4.80	4.53	4.28	4.25	4.80
			s contribute to			-	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.23	5.00
5. Di	d audio	visual	techniques enl	nance yo	ur understand	ding	8	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	3.97	****
			- ·																	
1	, ,		Discus			,	0	0	•	•	•	0		F 00	1 /1 204	F 00	4 25	4 00	4 11	F 00
			ssions contribu				9	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1384		4.37	4.08	4.11	5.00
			s actively end				9	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.37	5.00 ***
			or encourage		open discuss	sion	10	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1368	***	4.55	4.30	4.39	****
4. We	re spec	iai teo	chniques succes	ssiul			10	U	0	0	U	1	2	4.67	****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	4.00	****
			Field V	Work																
5. Di	d confe	rences	help you carry	y out fi	eld activitie	es	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.60	****
						Freque	ency	r Dist	tribi	ıtıoı	n									
Credi	ts Earn	ed	Cum. GPA	rades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	3		
00-2	7	 n	0.00-0.99	0	A 7			Red	nuire	 -d fo	or Ma	iors		0	Graduat		0	Majo	r	9
28-5		0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1			1000	2411	-u 10	J_ 1710	~ ) •	•	•	STAGAGE	_	•	1100	-	_
56-8		0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1			Ger	nera:	ı				0	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	major	4
84-1		3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			001		_				-	011001 9		-	2.011		-
Grad		0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0			Ele	ectiv	zes.				0	#### - 1	Means +	here a	re not	enous	rh
Grad	•	-	3.30 1.00	-	P 0									•	respons				_	,
					I O			O+1	ner					9	10050110	00 %	91			
					? 0			OCI						_						
					. 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	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals  5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  7. Was the grading system clearly explained  8. How many times was class cancelled  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 4	0 0 0 0 8 9 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 2 1 2 3 0	2 4 5 3 4 1 6 9 2	15 14 13 13 5 6 8 9 13	4.78 4.78 4.72 4.61 4.40 4.44 4.17 4.50 4.87	, -	4.78 4.72 4.61 4.40 4.44 4.17 4.50 4.87	4.62 4.58 4.62 4.53 4.34 4.32 4.32 4.55 4.43	4.28 4.23 4.27 4.20 4.04 4.10 4.16 4.69 4.06	4.27 4.18 4.22 4.21 4.05 4.11 4.08 4.67 4.02	4.78 4.78 4.72 4.61 4.40 4.44 4.17 4.50 4.87
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned  5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  Discussion	6 7 6 6 9	0 0 0 0 5	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 1 2 1 2	12 11 11 12 3	4.92 4.92 4.85 4.92 4.60	532/1572 225/1564 164/1559 247/1352	4.92 4.85 4.92 4.60	4.59 4.84 4.53 4.57 4.41	4.43 4.70 4.28 4.29 3.98	4.39 4.64 4.25 4.23 3.97	
<ol> <li>Did class discussions contribute to what you learned</li> <li>Were all students actively encouraged to participate</li> <li>Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion</li> <li>Were special techniques successful</li> </ol>	8 9 9	0 0 0 3	1 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	4 2 3 2	6 8 7 5		661/1384 342/1382 493/1368 137/ 948	4.27 4.80 4.70 4.71	4.37 4.65 4.55 4.52	4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95	4.11 4.37 4.39 4.00	4.27 4.80 4.70 4.71
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16 13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555 83/ 288				4.22 3.58	
Field Work  5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  Self Paced	8	0	0	1	0	8	2		68/ 312					
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students  Frequ	16	0 Dist	0 -rib	1 ution	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 110	****	4.60	3.99	4.05	***
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	iericy	DISC	.1.100		asons				Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27		Ger	- neral	L	or Ma	jor		0 0 0 3	Graduat Under-g #### - : respons	e rad 1 Means t		ire not	major enoug	17 2

Course-Section: MUSC 390B 0301 University of Maryland Page 1233 Title VOICE Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

JACKSON, JANICE Instructor: Fall 2008 Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

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

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

Title VIOLA Baltimore County FEB 11				0000	_ 1
Course-Section: MUSC 390D 0101 University of Maryland Pag			Baltimore	County	FEB 11
	Course-Section:	MUSC 390D 0101	University o	of Maryland	Page

Page 1234 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: LAMBROS, MARIA Fall 2008

Questionnaires:	2	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------------	---	---------	--------	------------	---------------

Enrollment:

2

			Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	UMBC Level	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this co	urse 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 go	als 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 g	oals 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 effe	ctiveness 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 acti-	vities 1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	291/ 312	2.00	3.77	3.68	3.60	2.00
	Frequency	/ Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expect	ed Grades			Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A	2	Required for Majors 0					0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	2	

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

Course-Section	: MUSC 390F 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1235
Title	ELECTRIC GUITAR	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	LAGANA, THOMAS	Fall 2008	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	2		

Questionnaires: 2 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
---

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

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390I 0101 University of Maryland
Title FLUTE Baltimore County
Instructor: CELLA, LISA Fall 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

2

University of Maryland Page 1236
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

		Frequencies				Instr	uctor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	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	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	5.00
_		<u> </u>	.,											

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

Course-Section	n: MUSC 390J 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1237
Title	OBOE	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	T.AMDE WIADIMIT	Fall 2008	TOP TERESUS

Fall 2008 urse Evaluation Questionnaire Instructor: LANDE, VLADIMIR
Enrollment: 2 Job IRBR3029

Ouestionnaires:	2	Student Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	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	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	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	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	d Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				2	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Course-Section: MUSC 390V 0101

1

ELECTRIC BASS

BALDWIN, THOMAS

Title

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

Page 1238 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student C	ourse Eval	luation (	Questionnaire
-----------	------------	-----------	---------------

		Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dep		ept UMBC Le		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	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	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	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.22	5.00
Freq	ıency	Dist	tribu	ıtioı	n									

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 390W 0201	University of	f Maryland	Page 1239
Title	UPRIGHT BASS	Baltimore	County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	RUAS, LAURA	Fall	2008	Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Title	UPRIGHT BASS	Baltimore	County	FEB	11,
	Instructor:	RUAS, LAURA	Fall	2008	Job	IRE
1	Enrollment:	2				

Questionnaires: 1

			Fre	eque			_		ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	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	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes		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	iencs	r Diet	trib	ıtioı	1									

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

Course-Section	n: MUSC 400 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1240
Title	SPECIAL PROJECTS	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	KIMBOYLE, DAVID	Fall 2008	Job IRBR3029

1110 01 00 00 1	TITLE OF THE CONTRACT OF THE C	1411 2000
Enrollment:	1	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.34	4.04	4.14	5.00
. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		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	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	3.77	3.68	3.95	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ıtioı	ı									

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

Course-Section: MUSC 401 0101 University of Maryland Title SPECIAL PROJECTS: COMP Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SMITH, STUART S

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1241

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

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

Course-Section: MUSC 417 0101 University of Maryland

0

Title SPEC TPCS IN MUSC TECH Baltimore County
Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL Fall 2008

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1242

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.50	5.00
		ctor make clear			3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.36	5.00
		uestions reflec			3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.48	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.36	5.00
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contrib	ute 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 wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o 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	e gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.32	4.16	4.27	4.67
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.55	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.43	4.06	4.24	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/1568	****	4.59	4.43	4.54	****
		ctor seem inter			5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1572	****	4.84	4.70	4.79	****
				xplained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1564	****	4.53	4.28	4.40	****
		-			5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1559	****	4.57	4.29	4.41	****
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1352	****	4.41	3.98	4.07	****
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	aga diga			what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	4 00	****/1384	****	4.37	4.08	4.35	****
				d to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1382	****	4.65	4.08	4.56	****
				d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1368	****	4.55	4.30	4.58	****
		echniques succe		d Open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 948	****	4.52	3.95	4.31	****
4. Were s	pecial c	eciniques succe	SSLUI		5	U	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	"""/ 940		4.52	3.95	4.31	
	_	Field																
5. Did co	nference	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	3.77	3.68	3.95	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	:			Ty	ne			Majors	l.
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ijors	S	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0				Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ıh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt	
				Ι 0		Otl	her					2						

Course-Section: MUSC 417 0201 University of Maryland Page 1243 Title SPEC TPCS IN MUSC TECH Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	d 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	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 480 0101
Title TOPICS IN MUSC/ART/SOC

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title TOPICS IN MUSC/A
Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2008

Page 1244

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did	vou gain ne	ew insights,skills f	rom this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.62	4.28	4.50	5.00
		ctor make clear the		2	0	0	0	0	1	5		195/1648	4.83	4.58	4.23	4.36	4.83
		estions reflect the		1	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.48	5.00
		ations reflect the		1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.36	5.00
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contribute t	o what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	476/1533	4.40	4.34	4.04	4.14	4.40
			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
		g system clearly exp		1	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.27	5.00
		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 v	would you g	grade the overall te	aching 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 instru	ctor's lectures wel	l prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.59	4.43	4.54	5.00
		ctor seem interested		3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was	lecture mat	erial 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 lecture	es contribute to wha	ribute to what you learned niques enhance your understanding			0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did a	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 disc	o what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	4.35	5.00	
		its actively encoura		4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.65	4.29	4.56	5.00
		ctor encourage fair		4	0	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.55		4.58	5.00
		chniques successful		4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95		
		- 1															
5 Were	requiremen	Laboratory nts 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
J. WCIC	requiremen	ies for tab reports	crearry specifica	O	O	Ü	U	O	Ü		3.00	1/ 555	3.00	1.00	1.25	1.11	3.00
		Seminar															
5. Were	criteria f	for grading made cle	ar	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	s 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
			Frequ	ency	n Dist	trib	nıt i oı	n									
			11040	iciic j	DID	CIID	acio										
Credits	Earned	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A б		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 5	0	Graduat	====== e	0	Majo	or	5
28-55					_			-						3			
56-83	83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0			Ger	nera	.1				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	3	
84-150																	
Grad.						ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ŗh
	Р 0											respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
	I 0					her					6						
		? 1															

Course-Section: MUSC 492 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1245
Title SENIOR PROJECT	Baltimore County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor: KIMBOYLE, DAVID	Fall 2008	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 1		
Questionnaires: 1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

			Fre	Frequencies				Instr	ructor	Course Dept		: UMBC Leve]		Sect
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	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

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 492 0301	University of	Maryland	Page 1246
Title	SENIOR PROJECT	Baltimore (	County	FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:	SMITH, STUART S	Fall 2	2008	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

#### o reports crearry specified 0 0 0 0

? 0

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

University o	f Maryland
Baltimore	County
Fall	2008

Course-Section: MUSC 492 0401

1

SENIOR PROJECT

YOSHIOKA, AIRI

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

Page 1247 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	Course	Evaluation	Ougetion	naira
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestroii	lialle

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

Credits Ea	arned	ed Cum. GPA Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	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	ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	mificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 690 8010 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County SEM: AMER CHAMBER MUSI

Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1248

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Ouestions						377	Fre	_	ncies	5	-		ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
		Questions			NR 	NA		2	3 	- 4 	5 	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,skil	ls fro	m 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	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.58	4.23	4.34	5.00
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.53	4.20	4.35	5.00
		system clearly	_	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.32	4.16	4.29	5.00
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646		4.55	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overal	l teac	hing 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	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	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	2	5.00	1/1564		4.53	4.28	4.41	5.00
4. Did the	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.41	5.00
		Discuss																
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.37	4.08	4.30	5.00
		_	_	d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382		4.65	4.29	4.52	5.00
		_		d 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 sp	pecial te	chniques succes	sful		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.52	3.95	4.03	5.00
		Laborat	-															
5. Were re	equiremen	its for lab repo	rts cl	early specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.80	4.29	4.66	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors				
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1						nuire	 ed fo	or Ma	iors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55									10	- ,	-	-	52 44446	-	-		_	ū
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	2	
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0												J				-		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0						Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h

Other

0

0

0

I