Course-Section: MUSC 101 0101

Title FUNDAMENTALS MUSIC THR

Instructor: TANOSAKI, KAZUK

Enrollment: 52
Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1097 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Cou	ırse Evalu	ation Que	stionnaire
-------------	------------	-----------	------------

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	0	-1	1 4	2.0	1	400 /1576	1	4 60	4 20	4 11	1
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	•	U	0	1	14	32	4.66	429/1576		4.62	4.30	4.11	4.66
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1 2	21	25 22	4.51	594/1576 658/1342	4.51	4.69	4.27	4.18 4.19	4.51 4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1		21 19	18	4.44	707/1520	4.44	4.75 4.68	4.32	4.19	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	Τ				. ,					
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	-	•	_	0	21	19	4.41	498/1465	4.41	4.45	4.12	4.02	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	3	0	0	1	19	19	4.46	448/1434	4.46	4.61	4.14	3.94	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	3	14	23	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	01	32	4.82	625/1574	4.82	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	21	26	4.55	355/1554	4.55	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	33	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	1142/1488	4.21	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	34	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1276/1486	3.69	4.63	4.32	4.26	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	1222/1489	3.83	4.67	4.32	4.22	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	33	6	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	2	Λ	2	2	1	2 00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	40	0	0	0	1	2	4		****/1270	****	4.47	4.17	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	40	0	0	0	1	3	2		****/1269	***	4.09	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques successful	40	4	0	0	2	ے 0	1		****/ 878		4.71	4.05	3.91	****
4. Were special techniques successful	40	4	U	U	2	U	Τ	3.67	***/ 8/8		4.05	4.05	3.91	
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	***	4.76	4.01	3.78	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 382	***	4.96	4.08	3.86	***
Frequ	encv	Diet	rib	ıtior	า									
rrequester Dibbi														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	47	Non-major	47
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 111 0101

Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB II

Instructor: CELLA, LISA

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1098 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque:	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	187/1576	4.85	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.8
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1576	4.89	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.8
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.0
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520	4.86	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.8
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	3.94	* *
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	4		657/1547	4.60	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1324/1574	4.31	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5		146/1554	4.87	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.92	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.8
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.
1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	274/1489	4.92	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	4.0
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	5.
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.65	4.05	3.91	4.
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	3.64	5.
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.84	4.60	4.44	**
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.84	4.67	4.68	* *
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.0
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	5			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 5		Re	 guir	ed f	or Ma	aiors	 5	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other		-	_	-	
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 111 0201

Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB II

Instructor: CELLA, LISA

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1099 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	Questions					NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			General	 1															
1 т	oid voi	ı gain ne	w insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	235/1576	4.85	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.82
			tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	10		152/1576	4.89	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.91
			estions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
			ations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	1			149/1520	4.86	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.89
					what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
					o what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	2		****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	3.94	****
			system clearly		-	0	2	0	0	0	2	7		217/1547	4.60	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.78
			was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	7			1236/1574	4.31	4.60	4.64		4.36
					hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1			116/1554	4.87	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.90
			Lecture	9															
1. 7	Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures	s well	prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	4.92	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. I	oid the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. 7	Was led	cture mat	erial presented	d and e	xplained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. I	oid the	e lecture	s contribute to	what	you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	4.92	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. I	Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	7	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00
	Discussion																		
1 т	Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learne					1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	++++/1070	4 00	1 17	1 17	2 06	****
					d to participate	10 10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1279 ****/1270	4.00 5.00	4.47 4.69	4.17 4.35	3.96 4.09	****
					d to participate d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1269	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	****
			chniques succes		a open arscussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 878	4.50	4.71	4.05	3.91	****
4. 1	METE PF	Deciai te	ciniiques succes	ssiui		10	U	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	7 676	4.50	4.05	4.05	3.91	
			Semina																
5. 1	Were cı	riteria f	or grading made	e clear		9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	****
			Field V																
5. I	Did cor	nferences	help you carry	y out f	ield activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	3.64	****
			Self I	Paced															
5. 1	Were th	nere enou	gh proctors for	r all t	he students	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	****
	F						Dist	trib	utior	ı									
Cred	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors	
							Dec			or Ma	ior		0	Graduat		0	 Majo		8
	28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 1						re(1u11	Lu I	T IId	ייטני	D	U	Graduati	_	J	Ma JC	·±	o
	56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 1						Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	3
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0						GCI	u.	-					onacı 'g.		-	14011		5	
Gra		0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	h
	-	-	3.22 2.20	•	P 0								-	response				_	
	I O				Oth	ner					9	F	~						
							_												

? 0

Course-Section: MUSC 112 0601 University of Maryland MUSIC REPERTOIRE LAGANA, THOMAS

I

0

0

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

5

Page 1100 JUL 2, 2009 Baltimore County Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

3

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

	Questions			NR	NA	Fre 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
1 Did vor	ı gəin nər	General insights,skil		m this course	1	0	0	Λ	1	1	2	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.25
_	_	tor make clear			1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	939/1576		4.69	4.27	4.18	4.25
		estions reflect			1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	770/1342		4.75	4.32	4.19	4.33
	_	ations reflect		1 5	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	859/1520	4.25	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.25
				what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	1		366/1465	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.02	4.50
	_	-		o what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.61	4.14	3.94	4.50
		system clearly		-	1	0	0	1	0	1	2		1041/1547	4.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.00
		was class cance			2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
				hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.50
		Lecture																
1 Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures		prepared	4	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	5 00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.41	****
					4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1493	****	4.86	4.73	4.65	****
	old the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear:						0	0	0	0	1		****/1486	****	4.63	4.32	4.26	****
	. Was recture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	1		****/1489	****	4.67	4.32	4.22	****
	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				4 4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	****
		Discuss							_									
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****
		-	_	d to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	Ι		****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****
				d open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were sp	pecial teo	chniques succes	ssiul		4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	***
		Self I	Paced															
5. Were th	nere enoug	gh proctors for	all t	he students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	3.86	****
				Frequ	ency	7 Dist	ribu	ıtioı	ı									
Goodin D		G GDA		Towns which Governor				D -					m				No	
Credits Ea	arnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades			Rea	sons	; 			Ту:	pe 			Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 2	Required for Major						3	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General						0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	2	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0 P 0		Electives						0	#### - 1 respons				_	h

Other

Course-Section: MUSC 126 0101

Title THEORY II: FORM&ANALYSI

Instructor: GENDELMAN, MART

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1101 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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
General	2	0	0	0	2	0	_	4 10	1005/1576	2 00	1 60	4 20	4 11	4 10
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	8	0		1035/1576		4.62	4.30	4.11 4.18	4.18 3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3 0	12 11	2		1197/1576 753/1342	3.67 4.28	4.69 4.75	4.27	4.18	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	2	0	0	2	11	7	4.35	768/1520		4.75	4.32	4.19	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2 5	6	/		,	4.17				
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	•	•	1	5	5	6	3.94	,	3.57	4.45	4.12	4.02	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0 1	1	3	5	6	4.07	852/1434		4.61	4.14	3.94	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	_	Τ	5	8	2		1338/1547	3.26	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	-7	9		1033/1574		4.60	4.64	4.59	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	7	1	3.57	1277/1554	3.59	4.52	4.10	4.01	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	Ω	1	7	2	4 10	1203/1488	3.75	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	3	5		1337/1493	4.65	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.30
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	3	4	2		1273/1486	3.45	4.63	4.32	4.26	3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	-,	4.20	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	,		4.60	4.03	3.91	
5. Did additivibual econniques chiance your anderstanding		o	_	_	_	3	,	3.00	5/1/12//	3.00	1.00	1.05	3.71	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	802/1279	4.17	4.47	4.17	3.96	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	784/1270	4.67	4.69	4.35	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	928/1269	4.25	4.71	4.35	4.09	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	***	4.98	4.03	3.64	***
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	3.86	****
Freque			rib	ıt i or	า									
Frequency Distr				.0101	•									

Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	 7	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	15	-		_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 126 0201 University of Maryland Title

THEORY II: FORM&ANALYSI

Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I. Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 5

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1102 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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	2	3	0	3.60	1410/1576	3.89	4.62	4.30	4.11	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1438/1576	3.67	4.69	4.27	4.18	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	879/1342	4.28	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1041/1520	4.17	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1347/1465	3.57	4.45	4.12	4.02	3.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.53	4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1459/1547	3.26	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	4.78	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1267/1554	3.59	4.52	4.10	4.01	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1406/1488	3.75	4.65	4.47	4.41	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	4.65	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1392/1486	3.45	4.63	4.32	4.26	3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	997/1489	4.20	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	889/1277	3.68	4.60	4.03	3.91	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	603/1279	4.17	4.47	4.17	3.96	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	4.67	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.25	4.71	4.35	4.09	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	***	4.98	4.03	3.64	***
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	3.86	***
Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	ation	ı									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-	_		
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 171 0101

Title INTERMEDIATE VOICE CLA

Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE

Enrollment: 16
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1103 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect			
		Questions	5			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			 ,																
1 Did 1101	u gain ng	General w insights,skil		this sours	10	5	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	500/1576	4.60	1 62	4.30	4.11	4.60
		ctor make clear				5	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	891/1576	4.30	4.62	4.27	4.11	4.80
		uestions reflect				5	0	2	0	1	3	4		1155/1342		4.75	4.32	4.19	3.70
		uations reflect				5	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	453/1520	4.56	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.56
		eadings contribu				5	3	1	1	3	0			1360/1465	3.14	4.45	4.12	4.02	3.14
	_	signments contri		_		5	4	0	0	2	3	1		1045/1434	3.83	4.61	4.14	3.94	3.83
		g system clearly		-	earnea	5	0	0	2	1	3	_		1145/1547	3.90	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.90
		was class cance	-	iied		5	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
		grade the overal		ing effecti	wenegg	5	2	0	1	0	3		4.25	712/1554		4.52	4.10		4.25
J. 110W WO	ara you s	grade the overal	rr ccacii	ing criceci	VCIICBB	3	2	O	_	O	5	1	1.25	712/1331	1.25	1.52	1.10	1.01	1.25
		Lecture	=																
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lectures	s well p	repared		10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem intere	ested in	the subjec	:t	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was led	cture mat	terial presented	d and ex	plained cle	arly	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute to	what y	ou learned	-	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	****
	or bla dadlovibadi coomiliquob cimanoe four analibranalis																		
		Discuss																	
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to w	hat you lea	rned	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	couraged	to partici	.pate	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****
		ctor encourage f		open discu	ssion	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful			12	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	***
		Semina					•	•		•	•						4 0 7		
5. Were ci	riteria 1	for grading made	e clear			14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	3.78	****
		Field W	Jork																
5 Did cor	nferences	s help you carry		eld activit	ies	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 326	****	4 98	4 03	3.64	****
J. Dia coi	III CI CIICCI	s neip you carry	y Out II	cia accivic	.105		O	O	O	O	O	_	3.00	/ 520		1.50	1.05	3.01	
		Self I	Paced																
5. Were th	here enou	ugh proctors for	r all th	e students		14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	3.86	****
	Fre					lency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0		7		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0		3														
56-83					General						6	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	15		
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 3 D 0																			
Grad.	rad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					Electives				3 #### - Means there are no				re not	enoug	jh			

Other

0

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Course-Section: MUSC 172C 0101

DICTION

5

KING, THOMAS

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

Spring 2009

Page 1104 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

		-					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	1	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.61	4.14	3.94	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.41	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1493	****	4.86	4.73	4.65	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1486	****	4.63	4.32	4.26	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1489	****	4.67	4.32	4.22	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	3.64	****

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

Course-Section: MUSC 175 0101 Title

INTERMEDIATE VOCAL MET

Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 4

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 1105 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

						Frequencies			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 Did vo	u dain ne	Genera w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4 00	1148/1576	4.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.25
		ations reflect			0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
				o what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	0		1204/1434	3.50	4.61	4.14	3.94	3.50
		g system clearl			0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	755/1547	4.33	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.33
		was class canc		IIIeu	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
				hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3		194/1554		4.52	4.10		4.75
9. HOW WO	uia you g	grade the overa	ii teac	ning effectiveness	U	U	U	U	U	1	3	4.75	194/1554	4.75	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.75
		Lectur	е															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	4.00
	Discussion																	
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	4.00
				d to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	4.00
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	3.91	5.00
		a .																
F 17		Semina	_		2	0	0	0	^	_	1	F 00	1 / 275	г оо	4 76	4 01	2 70	F 00
5. Were c	riteria I	for grading mad	e clear		3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.00
		Self	Paced															
5. Were th	here enou	igh proctors fo		he students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00
				Frequ	iency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 3							0	Graduat		0	Majo		2	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	Required for Majors				5	U	Graduati	C	U	Ma JC	,T	4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		Ge.	иста.	T				U	onder-g.	Lau	7	INOII-	iiia jul	۷
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					г 1.	ecti	760				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here =	re not	enous	rh
Grau.	P 0					ъT	CCLI	veb				U					_	111
I 0				responses to be significan Other 3			L											
				5 U	Other					ے								
				: U														

Course-Section: MUSC 178B 0101

Title BEGINNING KEYBOARD SKI

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Enrollment:

15 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1106 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

Questions			Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	8	4 20	1019/1576	4.35	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	222/1576		4.62	4.30	4.11	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1342		4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520		4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	1	1		1102/1465		4.45	4.12	4.02	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	0	1		****/1434		4.61	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3			339/1547		4.43	4.19	4.10	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7		1128/1574		4.60	4.64	4.59	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	871/1554	4.13	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.10
Lecture					_				== 0 /4 1 00					
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	Ţ	0	4	4.60	750/1488		4.65	4.47	4.41	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0 T	0	1	3		1376/1493		4.86	4.73	4.65	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10 10	0	0	0	1 1	1	3	4.40	821/1486 813/1489		4.63 4.67	4.32	4.26 4.22	4.40 4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	0	0	1	0	3 1		****/1277	4.4U ****	4.60	4.32	3.91	4.4U ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	TT	۷	U	U	Т	U	1	4.00	~~~/12//		4.60	4.03	3.91	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5 00	****/ 375	****	4 76	4.01	3 70	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	13	U	U	U	U	U	2	3.00	/ 3/3		4.70	4.01	3.70	
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	4.80	4.84	4.60	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35		4.84	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	4.50	4.83	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 382		4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00
			-	-	-	-	_		_, 302					
Frequ	iency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 178B 0201 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County

BEGINNING KEYBOARD SKI

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 10

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1107

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies				Instructor		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	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	637/1576	4.35	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	173/1576	4.84	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.88	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	395/1520	4.80	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1196/1547	4.25	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	758/1574	4.61	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	805/1554	4.13	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.17
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	26/ 40	4.80	4.84	4.60	4.44	4.80
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	19/ 24	4.80	4.90	4.83	4.71	4.80
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	28/ 35	4.60	4.84	4.67	4.68	4.60
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	21/ 28	4.50	4.83	4.78	4.65	4.50
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	1	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	180/ 382	4.71	4.96	4.08	3.86	4.43

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0	210001100		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0101 University of Maryland
Title INTERMEDIATE KEYBOARD Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1108

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 12
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

BEITH, NANCY S

Instructor:

			Fr	eque	ncie	s		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
Questions	NR	NA		_	3			Mean		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
General														
. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	500/1576	4.61	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.
. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.87	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.
. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.
. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	* *
. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1547			4.19	4.10	4.
. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	,			4.64		4.
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	772/1554	3.97	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.
Laboratory														
. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	**
Seminar														
. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	3.78	**
Field Work														
. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	3.64	**
Self Paced														
. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	177/ 382	4.80	4.96	4.08	3.86	4.
Freq	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00 27 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 2														

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-	_	•	
				2	Ο						

Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0201

Title INTERMEDIATE KEYBOARD

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1109 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	cructor	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	3	1	14	4.61	485/1576	4.61	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	91/1576	4.87	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1342		4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520		4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	10	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1465		4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434		4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	1	1	1		4.65	363/1547		4.43	4.19	4.10	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	739/1574		4.60	4.64	4.59	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	9	1	3.73	1180/1554	3.97	4.52	4.10	4.01	3.73
T a shows														
Lecture	1 2	0	0	0	1	0	_	1 71	F00/1/00	4 71	4 65	4 47	1 11	1 71
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 	13 13	0	0	0	1 1	0	6 6	4.71 4.71	589/1488 986/1493	4.71 4.71		4.47 4.73	4.41 4.65	4.71 4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.71	596/1486	4.71	4.86 4.63	4.73	4.05	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	789/1489	4.43	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	0	0	0	0	4		****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	****
J. Did addiovisual techniques emhance your understanding	11	2	U	U	U	U	-	3.00	/12//		4.00	1.03	3.71	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	0	0	2		****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	****
									,					
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 85	***	****	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	***	****	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work	1.0	0	0	0	0	^	1	F 00	****/ FO	****	****	4 40	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52 ****/ 48	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19 19	0 0	0 0	0	0	-	_	5.00	****/ 48 ****/ 44	****	****	4.40 4.73	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1 1		****/ 45	****	****		4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326		4.98	4.57 4.03	4.72 3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 326		4.90	4.03	3.04	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	4.84	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.90	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.84	4.67	4.71	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	4.83	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 382		4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00
onote onough proceeds for all one beautiful		_	3	3	3	,	3	2.00	1, 302	1.00	,0	1.00	2.00	5.00

Course-Section: MUSC 179B 0201

Title INTERMEDIATE KEYBOARD

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1109 JUL 2, 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	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 180 0101

Title BEGINNING PIANO CLASS

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 25

ITH, NANCY S Spring 2009

Page 1110 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				_	ncies	3			ructor	Course	_	UMBC		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	1	3	3	16	4.48	682/1576	4.48	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	350/1576	4.70	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	321/1342	4.74	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	1	3	17	4.59	406/1520	4.59	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	7	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.45	4.12	4.02	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	11	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	840/1434	4.09	4.61	4.14	3.94	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	774/1547	4.32	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	682/1554	4.29	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	422/1486	4.70	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	513/1489	4.65	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	6	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	569/1277	4.21	4.60	4.03	3.91	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were special techniques successful	20	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	3.78	****
0.16 . 7 . 1														
Self Paced	1.0	0	0	0	0	г	1	1 11	20 / 40	1 1 1	4 0 4	4 60	1 1 1	1 11
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16 17	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.44	30 / 40 **** / 24	4.44	4.84	4.60	4.44	4.44
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal		3 1	0	1 0	2	Ţ	2		,		4.90	4.83	4.71	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17				∠ 1	2	3	4.14	31/ 35 ****/ 28	4.14	4.84	4.67	4.68	4.14
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17 16	6 7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28 ****/ 382	****	4.83	4.78	4.65 3.86	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	Τр	/	U	U	Т	U	Τ	4.00	/ 382	^ ^ ^ *	4.96	4.08	3.86	

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	16	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0	-				-	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D	0			-		-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 181 0101

Title INTERMEDIATE PIANO CLA

Instructor: BEITH, NANCY S

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1111 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights, skills from	om this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	554/1576	4.56	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.56
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	215/1576	4.81	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.81
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflect the	expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	345/1342	4.71	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.71
		uations reflect the e	_	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44			4.68	4.25	4.09	4.44
	_	eadings contribute to	-	1	12	0	0	0	0	4		****/1465		4.45	4.12	4.02	****
		signments contribute		1	13	0	1	0	0	2		****/1434		4.61	4.14	3.94	****
	_	g system clearly explanation	ained	1	0	0	1	6	2	7		1113/1547		4.43	4.19	4.10	3.94
		was class cancelled grade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	1 4	0 0	0	0	0	4 8	12 5	4.75 4.38	758/1574 558/1554		4.60 4.52	4.64 4.10	4.59 4.01	4.75 4.38
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	442/1488	4.79	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.79
		ctor seem interested		3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493		4.86	4.73	4.65	4.93
		terial presented and		3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	499/1486		4.63	4.32	4.26	4.64
		you learned	3	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.50	
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enhance	your understanding	3	4	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	489/1277	4.30	4.60	4.03	3.91	4.30
		Discussion															
		ussions contribute to	_	14	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1279	***	4.47	4.17	3.96	***
		nts actively encourage		14	0	1	1	0	1	0		****/1270		4.69	4.35	4.09	****
		ctor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	14	0	1	0	1	0	1		****/1269		4.71	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were s	special t	echniques successful		14	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.91	****
		Laboratory															
		crease understanding		16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 234		****	4.23	4.08	****
_	_	ded with adequate back	-	16 16	0	0	0	0 0	0	1 1		****/ 240 ****/ 229		****	4.35	4.29	****
	_	materials available : structor provide assi		16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232		****	4.29	4.43 4.27	****
		nts for lab reports c		16	0	0	0	0	0	_		****/ 379		****	4.20	4.15	***
		Seminar															
5. Were c	criteria	for grading made clear	C	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	3.78	****
		Field Work															
5. Did co	onference	s help you carry out	field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	3.64	* * * *
F 177	.1	Self Paced		11	0	0	0	0	0	_	F 00	1 / 202	F 00	4 06	4 00	2.06	F 00
5. Were t	inere eno	ugh proctors for all	the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00
			Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	0	 Graduat	e	0	Majo	 or	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	В 2														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0		Gei	nera:	1			1	0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0								0			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0 P 0		Εle	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	Ju
			P 0		O+1	her					4	respons	es to E	e sigr	ıııcar	16	
			Ι 0		0.51	uer					4						

Course-Section: MUSC 183 0101 University of Maryland Page 1112 Title Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 INTERM STRING CLASS Job IRBR3029

Instructor: LADD, GITA Spring 2009

Enrollment: 10

Questionnaires: 5 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	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1494/1576	3.33	4.62	4.30	4.11	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1342	****	4.75	4.32	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1520/1520	1.50	4.68	4.25	4.09	1.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	4.45	4.12	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1227/1554	3.67	4.52	4.10	4.01	3.67
Self Paced														

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 4 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 382 **** 4.96 4.08 3.86 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	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	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			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Course-Section: MUSC 189 0101

19

GUITAR CLASS

FORSHEE, ZANE

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 18

Page 1113 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions	MB	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect
Žucaciona														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	457/1576	4.64	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	313/1576	4.73	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	179/1342		4.75	4.32	4.19	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	5	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	10	0	0	0	0	1		****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	3.94	****
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	7	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	816/1547	4.27	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	1	0	0	0	4	6		1003/1574	4.60	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	355/1554	4.56	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.56
Lecture	1.0	0	•	0	-	-		4 50	050 /1 400	4 50	4 65	4 45	4 41	4 50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	Ţ	Ţ	4		870/1488	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	678/1486		4.63	4.32	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12 12	0 5	0	0	1 0	0 1	5 0	4.67	500/1489 ****/1277	4.67 ****	4.67 4.60	4.32	4.22	4.67 ****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	***/12//	***	4.60	4.03	3.91	* * * *
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1270		4.69	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1269		4.71	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage rair and open discussion		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	O	1.00	, 1205		1.71	1.55	1.05	
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 1 A 11		Red	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	5
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0			-			_						3 -		
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ger	nera:	1				6	Under-g	rad 1	8	Non-	major	13
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 2 D 0													-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh

Other

5

Р

Ι

0

0

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0101 Title

PIANO

FRANKLIN, RACHE

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 4

Instructor:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1114 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equer	ncies	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 vou gain nev	w insights,skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
	tor make clear the e		0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	279/1576	4.88	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.75
4. Did other evalua	ations reflect the e	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned rea	adings contribute to	what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
6. Did written ass	ignments contribute	to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	ained	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1276/1547	4.17	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.67
8. How many times w	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1079/1574	4.75	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.50
9. How would you gr	rade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	4.67	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
	Lecture															
1. Were the instru		prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.50
	e the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
	the instructor seem interested in the subject lecture material presented and explained clea				0	0	0	1	1	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures	s contribute to what	you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1313/1489	3.50	4.67	4.32	4.22	3.50
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	ssions contribute to	what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.47	4.17	3.96	3.50
	ts actively encourag	_	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00
	tor encourage fair a		2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	5.00
	chniques successful		2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	3.91	
	Seminar															
5. Were criteria fo	Seminar Were criteria for grading made clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.00
		Frequ	anas	, Die	-rih	1+ i 01	2									
		rrequ	ченсу	מדמ	CTID	A C I OI	.1									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Tvi	oe.			Maiors	

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190A 0201 University of Maryland Title PIANO Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: HAWLEY, THOMAS
Enrollment: 6

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1115

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5			_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect			
		Questions	5		NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
		tor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576		4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
		estions reflect		1 3	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.75	4.32	4.19	****
		ations reflect			2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
				what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465		4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
				to what you learned	2	3	0	0	0	0	1		****/1434		4.61	4.14	3.94	****
		system clearly			2	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1547		4.43	4.19	4.10	4.67
		was class cance		21100	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574		4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
	-			ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	_		623/1554				4.01	
		T	_	-														
1 Wara +	ho inatru	Lecture ctor's lectures		propared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/1488	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.41	****
		tor seem inter			5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1493		4.86	4.47	4.41	****
				explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1486			4.73	4.05	****
		s contribute to			5 5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1489		4.63 4.67	4.32	4.20	****
4. DIG CII	e recture	s contribute to	o wnat	you learned	Э	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	***/1489	3.50	4.67	4.32	4.22	
		Discus	sion															
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	3.50	4.47	4.17	3.96	****
				ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270		4.69	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage i	fair ar	nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	****
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	3.91	****
		Field V	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	y out f	field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	3.64	****
		Self I	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribu	ute to	what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	32/ 40	4.33	4.84	4.60	4.44	4.33
2. Did st	udy quest	ions make clear	r the e	expected goal	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.90	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were y	our conta	cts with the in	nstruct	or helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.68	5.00
5. Were t	here enou	gh proctors for	r all t	the students	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	.
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				2	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### -				_	βh
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					1						

Course-Section: MUSC 190B 0201 University of Maryland Page 1116
Title VOICE Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 2
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quen	cies	\$		Instru	ıctor	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	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	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 190B 0301 University of Maryland Title VOICE Baltimore County Instructor: KING, THOMAS Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

University of Maryland Page 1117
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudent	Course	Fralustion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

			Fre	equei	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0				5.00	,	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.0
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.0
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	4.0
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	4.0
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	4.0
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.84	4.60	4.44	5.0
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.68	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	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	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: Title	MUSC 190C 0101 VIOLIN	University of Maryland Baltimore County	Page 1118 JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	YOSHIOKA, AIRI	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	3		
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

		Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		pt UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.83	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190C 0201 University of Maryland Title VIOLIN Baltimore County Instructor: TREMBLAY, CHRIS Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 3

5

Page 1119 JUL 2, 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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	415/1576	4.83	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1262/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190D 0101 University of Maryland Title VIOLA Baltimore County Instructor: LAMBROS, MARIA Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

3

University of Maryland Page 1120
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

	Frequencie							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	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576		4.69	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342		4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1557/1574	3.50	4.60	4.64	4.59	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	Ο	Ο	Ο	Ο	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493		4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486		4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
	_	ŭ	,	,	,	3	_	2.00	_, _ 103	2.00		52		2.00

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	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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 190E 0101 University of Maryland Title CELLO Baltimore County

Page 1121 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Instructor: LADD, GITA Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Quescionnaires.	T	beddelle	COULSE	Evaluacion	Quescionnaire

Enrollment: 5

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00

Credits Earned 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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section	: MUSC 190I 0201	University of Maryland	Page 1122
Title	FLUTE	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
T	KECKED LODE	Q	T-1- TDDD 2000

2009 Instructor: Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029 KESNER, LORI Enrollment: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	1	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.00
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1459/1547	3.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	3.00
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
	Self Paced														
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			1	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	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section:	MUSC 1900 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1123
Title	RECORDER	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	MORIN, JOSEPH	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029

	TLE COTTE ETT	Darormore country
Instructor:	MORIN, JOSEPH	Spring 2009
Enrollment:	1	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies						Instr	uctor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
Frequ	Frequency Distribution													

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	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	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 190Q 0201 Page 1124 JUL 2, 2009 Title SAXOPHONE Spring 2009 Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 2

Ouestionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

	Freq					3		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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	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	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	1			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section:	MUSC 190R 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1125
Title	TUBA	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	SIEHNDEL, TRAVI	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1					
Ouestionnaires:	1	Studen	t Course	Eva	luation	Ouestionnaire

	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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00

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	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	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	Λ						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1126 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionr	naire

			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	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	Λ	0	Λ	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.63	4.73	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00
3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		_	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	1/12//	5.00	4.00	4.03	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	3.91	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.00
Frequ		Dist	ribu	ıtion	ı									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	1	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	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	2	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0			_		-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 190S 0201

Title PERCUSSION DOVE, BARRY

Instructor: 9 Enrollment: Questionnaires: 3

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0201 University of Maryla Title RECITAL PREPARATION Baltimore County Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 10

10

University of Maryland Page 1127
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Ouestionnaire

	Ouestions					NA	Fre	_	ncies	5 1	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level	Sect Mean
		Question	5 									Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did y	you qain n	ew insights, ski	lls fro	m this course	4	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1299/1576	3.92	4.62	4.30	4.11	3.83
		ctor make clear			4	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	851/1576	4.42	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.33
3. Did t	the exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	4	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	4.75	4.75	4.32	4.19	****
4. Did o	other eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	4	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1520	4.67	4.68	4.25	4.09	****
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1465	4.67	4.45	4.12	4.02	****
6. Did v	written as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1434	4.67	4.61	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was t	the gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	339/1547	4.60	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.67
8. How r	many times	was class cance	elled		4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	4.92	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How v	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1554	4.81	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.75
		Lectur	-			0												
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	1		****/1488		4.65	4.47	4.41	****
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1493		4.86	4.73	4.65	****
				xplained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1486		4.63	4.32	4.26	****
		es contribute to			9	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1489		4.67	4.32	4.22	****
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	3.91	****
		Discus																
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	603/1279		4.47	4.17	3.96	4.33
				d to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270		4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00
				d open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1269		4.71	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	ssful		7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	4.65	4.05	3.91	4.67
				7		- 54												
				Frequ	iency	DIS	trib	101	1									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her					5						
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 191 0301 University of Maryland Title RECITAL PREPARATION Baltimore County Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 19

19

versity of Maryland Page 1128
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

				Frequencies			In		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	7	0	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	1148/1576	3.92	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	608/1576	4.42	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	4	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.75	4.32	4.19	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	6	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.45	4.12	4.02	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.61	4.14	3.94	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	492/1547	4.60	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	586/1574	4.92	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	129/1554	4.81	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.41	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1493	****	4.86	4.73	4.65	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1486	****	4.63	4.32	4.26	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1489	****	4.67	4.32	4.22	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1277	***	4.60	4.03	3.91	***

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	7	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	8
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	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	8	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193A 0101 University of Maryland Title PIANO Baltimore County Instructor: FRANKLIN, RACHE Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

5

University of Maryland Page 1129
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Onestionr	naire
beauciie	COULDC	E varaacron	Queberon	IUIIC

							Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 544		Genera w insights,ski	_	. +b:	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.27	4.11	5.00
					0	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/13/0	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1542	5.00	4.75	4.25	4.19	5.00
	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	1		1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
	_	-		what you learned	0	1 1	0	0	0	0	1		1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00
		_		-	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	5.00
	7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	
J. now would you grade the overall teaching circultiveness						U	U	U	_	U		1.00	JZ4/1334	1.00	1.52	4.10	1.01	1.00
1. Were th	he instri	Lecture actor's lectures		repared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
		tor seem inter	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly					0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
			_	ur understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	4.60		3.91	3.00
		-	-	3														
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ate to w	hat you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were al	ll studer	nts actively end	couraged	to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage :	fair and	open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	3.91	5.00
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Туј	oe			Majors	;
										- 				 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduate	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1				_	jh	
				P 0								response	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt		
I 0					Ot1	her					2							
? 0																		

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0201 University of Maryland Page 1130 VOICE Baltimore County

JUL 2, 2009 Title Spring 2009 JACKSON, JANICE Job IRBR3029 Instructor:

Enrollment:	2		
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionn	naire

		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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	4.63	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	4.83	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.75	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	4.75	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.50	4.60	4.03	3.91	4.00

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	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				2	Ο						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: MUSC 193B 0301 Title VOICE Instructor: KING, THOMAS Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 4

Page 1131 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1324/1574	4.63	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.83	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.75	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	678/1486	4.75	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.50	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00
Fire an		D:			_									

Credits Ea	arned	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	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-	-		
				2	1						

Course-Section:	MUSC 193C 0201	University of Maryland	Page 1132
Title	VIOLIN	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	TREMBLAY, CHRIS	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029

IICIE A	ATOTIN	Barcimore Councy	UUL 2, 200
Instructor: T	REMBLAY, CHRIS	Spring 2009	Job IRBR302
Enrollment:	1		
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

						equer	ncies	3		Instr	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 i	nsights,skills fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor	make clear the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluati	ons reflect the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
8. How many times was	class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grad	e the overall tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced sys	tem contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.84	4.60	4.44	5.00
		Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	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	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193E 0101 University of Maryland Page 1133
Title CELLO Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: LADD, GITA Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: LADD, GITA Spring 2009
Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quen	cies	\$		Instru	ictor	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		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	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	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 193F 0101

GUITAR

5

LAGANA, THOMAS

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

Page 1134 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst: Mean	ructor Rank		_		Level Mean	
1 5 1		Genera	_	. 1 . 1	-	0	0	0	•	•		F 00	1 /1556	F 00	4 60	4 20	4 11	F 00
		ew insights,ski			1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576		4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
		questions reflec			1	2 2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00 5.00	1/1342	5.00 5.00	4.75 4.68	4.32	4.19	5.00
		uations reflect			1	∠ 1	0	0	0	0	3		1/1520 1/1465	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00 5.00
	_	-		what you learned	2	1	0	0	0			5.00	1/1465		4.45		3.94	5.00
		_		o what you learned	_	U T	0	0	0	0			, -		4.61		4.10	5.00
	_	g system clearl; was class canc		inea	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1547			4.19		5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00 5.00	1/1574 1/1554		4.60	4.64	4.59 4.01	
9. HOW W	voula you	grade the overa	II teac	ning effectiveness	4	U	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
		Lectur	_															
1 1/2	+b	uctor's lecture			3	0	0	0	0	0	2	г оо	1 /1 400	г оо	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
		ctor's lecture			3	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1488 1/1493	5.00 5.00	4.86	4.47	4.41	5.00
				n the subject xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1493	5.00	4.63	4.73	4.05	5.00
		es contribute t			3	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1489	5.00		4.32	4.20	5.00
				our understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1409			4.03		5.00
o. Dia a	luulovisua	ir recillitques en	lance y	our understanding	3	U	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	1/12//	5.00	4.00	4.03	3.91	3.00
		Semina	r															
5 Were	ariteria	for grading mad	=		2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 375	5 00	4 76	4 01	3 79	5 00
J. Were	CIICEIIa	TOT GLACING MAG	e Cicai		2	U	U	U	U	U	J	3.00	1/ 3/3	3.00	1.70	1.01	3.70	3.00
		Field	Work															
5 Did o	onference	s help you carr		ield activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5 00	4 98	4 03	3 64	5 00
J. Dia c		.b neip you carr	y out 1	icia accivicies	3	J	Ü	O	0	Ü	-	3.00	1/ 320	3.00	1.50	1.05	3.01	3.00
				Frequ	ency	/ Dis	tribu	ıtior	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 1	A 3		Re	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 5	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 2			-			_						3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ŗh	
				P 0	FIECTIVES					respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	ıt				
				I O	Other 5				5	-								
				? 0														

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

5

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1135 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	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	3	Λ	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1576		4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/1342		4.75	4.32	4.19	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/1465		4.45	4.12	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/1434		4.61	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/1547		4.43	4.19	4.10	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1574		4.43	4.19	4.10	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/15/4		4.52		4.01	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	1/1354	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1493		4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1486		4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1489			4.32	4.22	
	_	-	-	-	-	-	_		_,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	3.96	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.09	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.09	****
Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe 			Majors	

Credits E	Carned	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	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
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	2	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193I 0101 University of Maryland Title FLUTE CELLA, LISA Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

4

Page 1136 Baltimore County Spring 2009 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	Frequencies					Instructor		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	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.84	4.60	4.44	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.68	5.00
Frequ			trib	utio:	n									

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 193K 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1137
Title	CLARINET	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	RICHARDS, MICHA	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029

FIII OI I III EII C.	۷			
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 193S 0101

PERCUSSION

4

GOLDSTEIN, THOM

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

Page 1138 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA 	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.67	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1262/1574	4.17	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.50	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.00

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	4	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	Ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				2	0						

Questionnaires: 2

Course-Section	: MUSC 193S 0201	University of Maryland	Page 1139
Title	PERCUSSION	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	DOVE, BARRY	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	2		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	_2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new	insights, skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	4.67	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructo	or make clear the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluat	tions reflect the e	expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned read	dings contribute to	what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.02	5.00
7. Was the grading s	system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.10	4.00
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1459/1574	4.17	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you gra	ade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.00
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	tor's lectures well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructo	or seem interested	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture mate	rial presented and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures	_	=	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.50	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00
	Field Work															
5. Did conferences l		field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	3.64	5.00
		Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	ı									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Title

Questionnaires: 1

Course-Section: MUSC 193W 0201 University of Maryland Page 1140 JUL 2, 2009 UPRIGHT BASS Job IRBR3029 Instructor: RUAS, LAURA 3 Enrollment:

Ctudont	Comman	Errolmotion	Ouestionnair	_
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnari	=

			Fr	eque:	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3 0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.84	4.60	4.44	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.68	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.83	4.78	4.65	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.86	5.00
Free	quency	y Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	5			Re	ason	5			Ту	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193Y 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 SAX IMPROV Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW Spring 2009 Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Instr	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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	3.94	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1141

1/1489 5.00 4.67 4.32 4.22 5.00

Frequency Distribution

0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0		1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	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	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section:	MUSC 194A 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1142
Title	PIANO	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	FRANKLIN, RACHE	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:	FRANKLIN, RACHE	Spring 2009	Job
Enrollment:	1		

Questionnaires: 1

			Fre	equei	ncies	S		Insti	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.09	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons	Reasons			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	1	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	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 194E 0101 University of Maryland Title CELLO Baltimore County

Questionnaires: 1

JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Instructor: LADD, GITA Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 1

Student Co	ourse Eva	luation (Juesti	onnaire
------------	-----------	-----------	--------	---------

Page 1143

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.19	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.65	4.47	4.41	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1493	4.00	4.86	4.73	4.65	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.09	5.00
Freq	ıency	Dis	tribu	ıtioı	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0			quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 5	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	0

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	Туре			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	ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section:	MUSC 194G 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1144
Title	CLASSICAL GUITAR	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	FORSHEE, ZANE	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029

111001 00001	r ordering / Drawn	SF12113 2007
Enrollment:	1	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.59	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.01	5.00
_		<u> </u>												

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	L	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	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 211 0101

Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB IV

Instructor: CELLA, LISA

Enrollment: 33 Questionnaires: 32

Page 1145 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequencies Instructor Course Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean	-	BC Level Sect
	ricair rice	an Mean Mean
General		
	4.62 4.	
·	4.69 4.3	
	4.75 4.3	
·	4.68 4.3	
	4.45 4.1 4.61 4.1	
	4.61 4.1	
	4.60 4.0	
	4.52 4.5	
7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 13 0 0 1 7 11 4.33 379/1334 4.33	1.32 1.	10 4.05 4.55
Lecture		
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 20 0 0 0 5 7 4.58 774/1488 4.58	4.65 4.4	47 4.44 4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 20 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 908/1493 4.75	4.86 4.	73 4.75 4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 20 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 468/1486 4.67	4.63 4.3	32 4.29 4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 20 0 0 0 1 3 8 4.58 602/1489 4.58	4.67 4.3	32 4.31 4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding $$ 22 $$ 4 $$ 0 $$ 0 $$ 1 $$ 2 $$ 3 $$ 4.33 ****/1277 ****	4.60 4.0	03 4.01 ****
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 26 0 1 0 1 1 3 3.83 ****/1279 ****	4 457 4	17 / 1/ ****
1. Pla olab alboabling conclidate to mad for learner 20 0 1 1 1 5 5.05 71275	4.47 4.1 4.69 4.1	1/ 4.14
	4.69 4.1 4.71 4.1	33 1.30
		05 3.92 ****
1. Wele special techniques successful	1.05 1.0	05 5.92
Laboratory		
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 31 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 234 ****	**** 4.3	23 4.44 ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 31 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 240 ****	**** 4.	35 4.47 ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 31 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 229 ****	**** 4.	51 4.65 ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 31 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 232 ****	**** 4.2	29 4.38 ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 31 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 379 ****	**** 4.2	20 4.29 ****
Quantum con-		
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 ****	++++ 1 '	72 4 78 ****
1. Note appropried topics introduced discussions of the contraction of	**** 4.'	72 1.70
	**** 4.0	05 1.72
	**** 4.0	01 1.05
<u>.</u>	4.76 4.0	01 1.00
3. Nere directia for grading made dear	1.,0 1.	01 1.21
Field Work		
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 ****	**** 4.	48 4.74 ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 31 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 ****	**** 4.	40 4.71 ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 31 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 ****	**** 4.	73 4.69 ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations $31~0~0~0~0~1~5.00$ ****/ $45~$ ****	**** 4.	57 4.64 ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 25 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 ****/ 326 ****	4.98 4.0	03 4.43 ****
Self Paced	4 04 4	60 E 00 ****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 31 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 40 ****	4.84 4.0	00 3.00
	4.90 4.8	
•	4.84 4.0	07 3.00
1. Has one recassion, eacoring significant and the second in the second	4.83 4.	70 3.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 25 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 ****/ 382 ****	4.96 4.0	00 4.39 ^^^

Course-Section: MUSC 211 0101

Title MUSICIANSHIP LAB IV

Instructor: CELLA, LISA

Enrollment: 33
Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1145 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	12
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	22	-		_	
				?	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 214 0101

University of Maryland

Baltimore County HIST JAZZ: ORIGINS-PRE Spring 2009

Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM

Enrollment: 76 Questionnaires: 72

Title

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1146 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

			LTE	eque	псте	:5		IIISU	LIUCLOI	Course	Dept	UMBC	телет	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0.1	•	_	_				4 4 4 4					4 0=	4 4 0
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	21	0	0		13	11					4.62	4.30		4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	21	0	2	3	15	15	16	3.78	1299/1576	3.78	4.69	4.27	4.32	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	21	0	2	2	10	15	22	4.04	961/1342	4.04	4.75	4.32	4.41	4.04
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	21	35	1	4	3	5	3	3.31	****/1520	****	4.68	4.25	4.26	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	22	1	2	5	9	15	18		1028/1465		4.45	4.12	4.09	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	21	41	1	4	2	2	1		****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.06	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	21	0	1	5	8	12	25	4.08	992/1547	4.08	4.43	4.19	4.22	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	22	0	0	0	1	40	9	4.16	1386/1574	4.16	4.60	4.64	4.62	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	3	0	5	9	21	8	3 74	1173/1554	3 74	4 52	4.10	4.05	3 74
or now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	3	o	5	_	21	O	3.71	11/3/1331	3.71	1.52	1.10	1.03	3.71
<u>-</u> .														
Lecture														
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 	24	0	2	2	7	14	23	4.13	1192/1488	4.13	4.65	4.47	4.44	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	1	1	1	3	42	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.86	4.73	4.75	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	2	2	6	16	21	4 11	1069/1486	4.11	4.63	4.32	4.29	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	1	1	1	8	10	27	4.30	927/1489	4.30	4.67		4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	9	2	3	5	5	25	4.20	585/1277	4.20	4.60	4.03	4.01	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	8	4	6	4	6	2 86	1220/1279	2.86	4.47	4.17	4.14	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	2	3	8	5			1083/1270	3.69	4.69	4.35	4.30	3.69
						-								
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	2	1	4	4	18	4.21	846/1269	4.21	4.71	4.35	4.29	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	43	23	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.92	***
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	67	3	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****
					-		-		, -					
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	69	0	2	0	1	0	0		****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	69	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	69	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 232	***	****	4.29	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	70	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 379	***	***	4.20	4.29	****
ov mene neglinemente nei eine neperat receine, apronness									,					
Comings														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	69	2	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	70	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	70	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	70	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	***	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	0	1	1	0	0	16		151/ 375	4.61	4.76	4.01		4.61
5. Were criteria for grading made crear	24	U		Τ.	U	U	10	4.01	131/ 3/3	4.01	4.70	4.01	4.21	4.01
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	70	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	***	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	70	0	1	1	0	0	0		****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****
									,	****	****			****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	70	0	1	1	0	0	0		,			4.57	4.64	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	45	0	2	0	0	0	25	4.70	141/ 326	4.70	4.98	4.03	4.43	4.70
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	70	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	4.84	4.60	5.00	****
		1	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 24	****				****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	70					-	-		,		4.90	4.83	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	70	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/ 35	****	4.84	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	70	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 28	****	4.83	4.78	5.00	***
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	1	1	0	0	0	24	4.84	172/ 382	4.84	4.96	4.08	4.39	4.84

Course-Section: MUSC 214 0101

Title HIST JAZZ: ORIGINS-PRE

Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, THOM

Enrollment: 76
Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1146 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	2	В	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	11	Under-grad	72	Non-major	70
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	9	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 217 0101

Title ROCK & RELATED MUSIC

Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH

Enrollment: 139
Questionnaires: 137

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1147 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Questio		MR	NA	Fre	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
																		·
		Gener	al															
		ew insights,sk			68	0	0	0	5	10	54	4.71	347/1576		4.62	4.30	4.35	4.71
		ctor make clea			68	0	0	2	6	15	46	4.52	581/1576	4.52	4.69	4.27	4.32	4.52
	_	uestions refle			68	0	1	1	5	15	47	4.54	552/1342		4.75	4.32		4.54
		uations reflec			68	48	0	0	3	5	13		****/1520	****	4.68	4.25	4.26	****
	_	-		what you learned	68	46	2	4	6	5	6		****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.09	****
		_		o what you learned	68	61	0	0	1	3	4		****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.06	****
	-	g system clear		ined	70	1	0	0	7	12	47	4.61	411/1547	4.61	4.43	4.19	4.22	4.61
	-	was class can			69	0	0	2	28	34	4		1551/1574		4.60	4.64		3.59
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the over	all teac	hing effectiveness	75	1	0	0	11	34	16	4.08	881/1554	4.08	4.52	4.10	4.05	4.08
		Lectu	re															
1. Were th	e instr	uctor's lectur		prepared	72	0	0	0	1	12	52	4.78	442/1488	4.78	4.65	4.47	4.44	4.78
		ctor seem inte			72	0	0	0	0	4	61	4.94	390/1493	4.94	4.86	4.73	4.75	4.94
				xplained clearly	71	0	0	0	1	18	47	4.70	422/1486	4.70	4.63	4.32	4.29	4.70
4. Did the	lecture	es contribute	to what	you learned	71	0	0	0	0	11	55	4.83	274/1489	4.83	4.67	4.32	4.31	4.83
5. Did aud	liovisua	l techniques e	nhance y	our understanding	70	2	0	0	4	10	51	4.72	176/1277	4.72	4.60	4.03	4.01	4.72
		D																
1 Did ala	aa diaa	Discu		what you learned	112	0	12	1	1	1	10	2 04	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.14	****
				d to participate	114	0	13	2	4	0	4	2.13	****/1270	****	4.47	4.17	4.14	****
		_	_		113	0	9	0	6	0	9		****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.30	****
	d the instructor encourage fair and open discuss re special techniques successful					23	1	0	0	0	2		****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.92	****
4. Were sp	ere special techniques successful							U	U	U	2	3.07	/ 0/0		1.03	1.05	3.72	
		Labor	atory															
2. Were yo	u provid	ded with adequ	ate back	ground information	134	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****
0 11		Semin		4-4-3-3	125	1	0	0	^	1	0	4 00	****/ 79		****	1 60	4 70	****
				ividual attention		1 1	0	0	0 1	1	0	1.00	, , , ,	****		4.69	4.72	****
5. were cr	ileria i	for grading ma	de clear		127	Τ	U	U	1	U	8	4.78	****/ 375		4.76	4.01	4.21	
		Field	Work															
1. Did fie	eld exper	rience contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	136	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you	clearly	y understand y	our eval	uation criteria	136	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****
3. Was the	instru	ctor available	for con	sultation	136	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****
5. Did con	ferences	s help you car	ry out f	ield activities	121	1	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.43	****
		colf	Paced															
1 Did cel	f_naced			what you learned	136	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.84	4.60	5.00	****
	_	agh proctors f		-	106	1	0	0	1	0	29		****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	4.39	****
J. Were cm	iere enot	agii proctors r	or arr c	ne scudencs	100		U	U	1	U	20	4.93	/ 302		4.50	1.00	4.32	
				Frequ	uency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	ırned	Cum. GP	A	Expected Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27							ed f	or M	ajor	s 2	17	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	2
							nera:	1			^	10	IIndox ~	~~d 1?	7	Moss	ma i a	125
84-150								т			2		Under-g	rau 13	1	MOIJ-	-major	T 2 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 11	D 0 F 0		E.1	ectiv	ves.				3	#### -	Means +	here s	re not	- enouc	ιh
oraa.	U	3.30-4.00		1 0		14 نت	CCCT,	v CD				J	ππ## -	LICUIID L	c	1100	. circug	,

Other

7

0

0

1

I

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

WONNEBERGER, AL

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1148

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 11
Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fre	equer	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did vo	u gain ne	w insights,skil	=	this course	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.62	4.30	4.35	4.63
		tor make clear			4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	910/1576		4.69	4.27	4.32	4.29
		estions reflect			4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	209/1342		4.75	4.32	4.41	4.86
		ations reflect			4	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	921/1520	4.20	4.68	4.25	4.26	4.20
5. Did as:	signed re	adings contribu	ıte to v	what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1218/1465	3.57	4.45	4.12	4.09	3.57
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contri	ibute to	what you learned	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.06	****
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	4	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	939/1547	4.14	4.43	4.19	4.22	4.14
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.60	4.64	4.62	4.86
9. How wo	uld you g	rade the overal	ll teach	ning effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.52	4.10	4.05	4.67
		Lecture	_															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	_	prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.44	5.00
		tor seem intere			8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.75	5.00
				plained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.63	4.32	4.29	4.67
		s contribute to			8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.31	5.00
		our understanding	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.01	5.00		
		Discuss					_	_	_	_	_							
				what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.14	5.00
				d to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.30	5.00
				d open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.29	5.00
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succes	sstul		8	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.92	****
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	=			Ту	ne			Majors	ı
									- 									
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1				_					_				_	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 1														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	h
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot.	her					5						
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 226 0101

THEORY IV: MUSIC WRITIN

Title Instructor:

Enrollment: 29 Questionnaires: 24

MACAULAY, JANIC

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1149 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

				Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	N.	R	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course		0	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	527/1576	4.58	4.62	4.30	4.35	4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61			4.69	4.27	4.32	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals		0	0	0	0	3	2	19	4.67			4.75	4.32		4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		0	5	0	1	1	5	12	4.47			4.68	4.25	4.26	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learn		1	6	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	,		4.45	4.12	4.09	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you lea		1	9	0	1	1	1	11	4.57			4.61	4.14	4.06	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		1	0	0	1	3	7	12	4.30			4.43	4.19		4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	1	0	0	0	6	17	4.74				4.64	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effective		4	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	, -			4.10	4.05	
Lecture	1	^	0	0	0	0	2	11	4 70	440/1400	4 70	4 65	4 47	1 11	4 70
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1		0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	,		4.65	4.47	4.44	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1		0	0	0	0	1	13		445/1493		4.86	4.73	4.75	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clear	_		0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50			4.63	4.32		4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1		0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71			4.67	4.32	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand	ling 1	Τ	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	215/1277	4.67	4.60	4.03	4.01	4.67
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learn	ied 1	8	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1129/1279	3.33	4.47	4.17	4.14	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participa		8	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1024/1270	3.83	4.69	4.35	4.30	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss		8	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.71	4.35	4.29	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	3.92	****
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 375	****	176	4 01	4 21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	3	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 3/5		4.76	4.01	4.21	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activitie	s 1	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 326	***	4.98	4.03	4.43	****
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	4.39	****
										,					
	Frequen	су	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr	ades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8			Rec	nuir	ed f	or Ma	ior		0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	 19
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 6			1000	1411	-a 1	J_ 110	- J U L	~	-	Gradac	_	J	1100) (-	
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 4			Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	24	Non-	major	5
84-150 8 3.00-3.49 2 D 0			501							2		-		, 0 =	-
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 12 F 0			Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoua	h
P 0										respons				_	
I 0			Oth	ıer				1	9			3			
? 3				-											

Course-Section: MUSC 230 0101 Title

University of Maryland MUSICS OF THE WORLD Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: BECK, GINA C

Enrollment: 40 Questionnaires: 39

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1150 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
2. Did the 3. Did the 4. Did oth 5. Did ass 6. Did write 7. Was the	e instruce exam que her evalue signed resitten asse grading		the experts the experts the experts to who but to response to the experts to the	ected goals pected goals ected goals hat you learned what you learned	16 16 16 17 16 16 16	0 0 0 20 10 21 0	1 0 2 0 2 0 0	2 3 2 0 0 0	5 6 6 1 3 1 6	4 4 4 0 4 0 4	11 10 9 1 4 1 13 19	3.91 3.70 4.00 3.62 4.00 4.30	1194/157 1227/157 1157/134 ****/152 1201/146 ****/143 784/154 625/157	3.91 3.70 **** 3.62 4 *** 7 4.30	4.62 4.69 4.75 4.68 4.45 4.61 4.43 4.60	4.30 4.27 4.32 4.25 4.12 4.14 4.19 4.64	4.35 4.32 4.41 4.26 4.09 4.06 4.22 4.62	3.96 3.91 3.70 **** 3.62 **** 4.30 4.83
			.l teach:	ing effectiveness	17	0	2	1	7	10	2		1350/155		4.52			3.41
2. Did the 3. Was led 4. Did the	e instruc cture mat e lecture	ctor's lectures tor seem intere erial presented s contribute to	the subject plained clearly ou learned	18 17 18 18	0 0 0 0	1 0 4 1 0	1 1 1 1 0	2 1 4 3 2	5 2 3 3 2	12 18 9 13 18	4.68	1126/148 1029/149 1313/148 969/148 176/127	3 4.68 5 3.57 9 4.24	4.65 4.86 4.63 4.67 4.60	4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.44 4.75 4.29 4.31 4.01		
2. Were al 3. Did the	id audiovisual techniques enhance your understand: Discussion id class discussions contribute to what you learned ere all students actively encouraged to participate id the instructor encourage fair and open discussionere special techniques successful					0 0 0 4	2 1 2 0	1 2 1 0	1 0 0 0	1 1 0 1	0 1 2 0	2.80	****/127 ****/127 ****/126 ****/ 87) **** 9 ****	4.47 4.69 4.71 4.65	4.17 4.35 4.35 4.05	4.14 4.30 4.29 3.92	* * * * * * * * * * * *
5. Were cr	riteria f	Seminar or grading made			33	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 37	5 ****	4.76	4.01	4.21	****
5. Did cor	nferences	Field W help you carry		eld activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	4.98	4.03	4.43	5.00
5. Were th	here enou	Self F gh proctors for		e students	30	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	****/ 38	2 ****	4.96	4.08	4.39	***
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Frequ Expected Grades	iency	Dist	tribu		n ason:	a			η·	уре			Majors		
00-27	0	A 6		Red	 quire	ed fo				8	 Gradua		0	 Majo		8		
28-55 56-83 84-150	3-55 3 1.00-1.99 1 B 11 5-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 3						- neral			-		2	Under-	grad 3	39		-major	31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 1		Ele Otl	ectiv ner	ves				0		Means t ses to b			_	h

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101 University of Maryland Page 1151
Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009

Spring 2009

Job IRBR3029

Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS
Instructor: YOSHIOKA, AIRI (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 19

Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1576	4.87	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.87	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1520	****	4.68	4.25	4.25	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1003/1574	4.57	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.72	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.58
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	***	4.98	4.03	4.23	***
Self Paced 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0			-		-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-	•	_	
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 301 0101 University of Maryland Page 1152 Title CHAMBERS PLAYERS Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009

Instructor: TREMBLAY, CHRIS (Instr. C) Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

		,	
Enrollment:	19		

FIII OIIIMEIIC:	19
Questionnaires:	5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			_		NTD	377		_	ncies	5	_		ructor	Course	_			
		Question	.s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4 	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1576	4.87	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.80
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.87	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.80
3. Did th	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the e	xpected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1520	***	4.68	4.25	4.25	****
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	3.00
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute	to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expl	ained	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.67
8. How ma	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1003/1574	4.57	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.60
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1554	4.72	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.58
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out	field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.23	****
_		Self																
5. Were t	here enou	ugh proctors fo	r all	the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	ior		1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		110	-14		01	.,	_	_	or addag	_	Ü	110000	-	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-q	rad	5	Non-	-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0											-		5	_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	: enouc	rh
	-	2.23 2.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		Ot.1	her					2						
				? 0		00.						_						

Course-Section	: MUSC 301 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1153
Title	CHAMBERS PLAYERS	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	SPECE, RICHARD	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	6	
Questionnaires:	2	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	2	5.00	1/1576	4.87	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	4.87	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.57	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	4.72	4.52	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.11	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	1									

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

Course-Section: MUSC 303 0101

Title MD CAMERATA--CHAMBER C

Instructor: WANENCHAK, L

Enrollment: 31

Spring 2009 Questionnaires: 31

Page 1154 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

							Fr	equei	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	5	0	1	2	6	7	10	3.88	1257/1576	3.88	4.62	4.30	4.30	3.88
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	5	0	1	1	2	9	13	4.23	958/1576	4.23	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.23
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	expected goals	5	19	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/1342	***	4.75	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	6	5	0	2	1	8	9	4.20	921/1520	4.20	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.20
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ate to	what you learned	5	23	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1465	***	4.45	4.12	4.09	****
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	5	21	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	5	1	0	5	6	4	10	3.76	1235/1547	3.76	4.43	4.19	4.21	3.76
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		6	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	586/1574	4.84	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.84
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	9	0	1	0	8	11	2	3.59	1270/1554	3.59	4.52	4.10	4.09	3.59
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	19	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	1171/1488	4.17	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.17
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	20	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	557/1493	4.91	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.91
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	20	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1010/1486	4.18	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.18
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	21	0	1	1	1	1	6	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	22	4	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	4.11	***
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1279	***	4.47	4.17	4.20	****
				d to participate	28	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1270	***	4.69	4.35	4.42	****
				d open discussion	28	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1269	***	4.71	4.35	4.41	****
		echniques succes		-	28	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.09	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria :	for grading made	e clear	•	28	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****
		Field V	Nork															
5. Did co	nference			ield activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.23	****
		Self 1	Paced															
5. Were t	here eno	ugh proctors for		he students	21	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	า									
				-	1								_				,	
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5 			Ту	pe 			Majors 	;
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 17		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	12
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Gei	nera	1				9	Under-g	rad 3	31	Non-	-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -				_	jh
				P 1								_	respons	es to k	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner				1	1						
				? 1														

Course-Section: MUSC 304 0101 University of Maryland Title UMBC JUBILEE SINGERS

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: JACKSON, JANICE

Enrollment: 38 Questionnaires: 35

Page 1155 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

- · ·				
Ctudont	('011760	Evaluation	()1100+101	סמוכמו

							Fr	eque	ncies	S		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 voi	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	-	om this course	25	0	0	0	0	2.	8	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.80
		ctor make clear			25	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	-, -		4.69	4.27	4.28	4.90
		uestions reflec			25	4	0	0	0	1	5		****/1342		4.75	4.32	4.30	***
		uations reflect			26	6	0	0	0	1	2		****/1520	****	4.68	4.25	4.25	***
				what you learned	26	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.09	***
				o what you learned	26	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	***
		g system clearl			26	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00
		was class cand			26	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.33
				ching effectiveness	25	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	160/1554	4.80	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.80
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.47	***
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1493	****	4.86	4.73	4.70	***
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1486	****	4.63	4.32	4.32	***
1. Did the	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	****	4.67	4.32	4.34	***
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.20	***
2. Were a	.ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.42	***
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	33	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.41	****
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	le clear		34	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.23	****
		Self	Paced															
5. Were t	here enou	ugh proctors fo	r all t	the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	4.24	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	L	Expected Grades				Re	asons	S			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	 0.00-0.99	1	 А 9				 ed f	or Ma	aior		0	 Graduat		0	Majo		 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		κe	quit	eu I	OT IAIG	JOL	5	U	Graduat	C	U	Ma JC	,T	3
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ga	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 3	5	Non-	major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		GE	пета	_				T	onder-9	rau 3		NOII-	ııa jul	34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		E.J	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enouc	ſh
craa.	J	3.30 1.00	5	P 0		11 ن	CCCI	v CD				_	respons					,
				I 0		O+	her					3	TCCCOID	-2 CO L	5191			
				3 0		00						-						

Course-Section: MUSC 305 0101 Title

UMBC COMMUNITY SYMPHON

Instructor: RICHARDS, MICHA

Enrollment: 53 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1156 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

						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
			General															
1. Di	id you	gain	new insights, skills	from this course	8	0	0	0	0	5	35	4.88	187/1576	4.88	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.88
2. Di	id the	instr	uctor make clear the	e expected goals	8	0	0	0	0	1	39	4.97	46/1576	4.98	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.97
3. Di	id the	exam	questions reflect th	ne expected goals	8	27	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00
			luations reflect the		8	26	0	0	0	1	13		110/1520	4.93	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.93
				to what you learned	8	31	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.09	****
			_	te to what you learned	10	30	0	0	0	0	8		****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****
			ng system clearly ex		8	11	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	49/1547		4.43	4.19		4.97
			s was class cancelle		8	0	0	0	0	10	30	4.75	758/1574		4.60	4.64	4.61	
9. Ho	ow wou	.ld you	grade the overall t	teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	40	4.95	58/1554	4.95	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.95
			Lecture															
1. We	ere th	e inst	ructor's lectures we	ell prepared	35	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.47	5.00
			uctor seem intereste		34	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Wa	as lec	ture m	aterial presented ar	nd explained clearly	35	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Di	id the	lectu	res contribute to wh	nat you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	155/1489	4.92	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.92
5. Di	id aud	iovisu	al techniques enhand	ce your understanding	36	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	4.11	****
1 5		22	Discussion		4 -	0	0	0	0	_	2	F 00	++++ /1070	****	4 47	4 1 7	4 00	****
				to what you learned raged to participate	45 45	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1279 ****/1270	****	4.47 4.69	4.17	4.20 4.42	****
				and open discussion	45	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1269	****	4.69	4.35	4.42	****
			uctor encourage fair techniques successfi	_	45	1	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 878		4.71	4.35	4.41	****
4. We	ere sp	eciai	teciniques successit	11	77	_	U	U	U	U	3	3.00	/ 6/6		4.05	4.05	4.05	
			Seminar															
5. We	ere cr	iteria	for grading made c	lear	35	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	4.12	5.00
			Field Worl	5														
5. Di	id con	ferenc	es help you carry ou		35	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	4.23	5.00
													_,					
			Self Pace															
5. We	ere th	ere en	ough proctors for a	ll the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credi	its Ea	rned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту]	pe 			Majors	
00-2	27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 34		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	23
28-5	55	7	1.00-1.99 0	в 0						-						-		
56-8		4	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Ger	nera	1			1	0	Under-g	rad 4	8	Non-	major	25
84-1		7	3.00-3.49 2	D 0														
Grad	d.	0	3.50-4.00 22	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				4	#### - I				_	h
				P 0									response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I O		Ot]	her				2	2						
				? 2														

Course-Section: MUSC 307B 0101 University of Maryland Page 1157
Title JAZZ BIG BAND Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 12

Questionnaires: 12 Student Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
-----------------------------------	------------	---------------

		Questions	3		NR	NA			ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	=															
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	527/1576		4.62	4.30	4.30	4.58
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	201/1576		4.69	4.27	4.28	4.83
		uestions reflect			0	11	0	0	0	0	1		****/1342		4.75	4.32	4.30	****
		uations reflect		_	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520		4.68	4.25	4.25	5.00
				what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	4		1/1465		4.45	4.12	4.09	5.00
				what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	1		****/1434		4.61	4.14	4.15	****
		g system clearly		ined	1	2	0	0	1	1	7		339/1547		4.43	4.19	4.21	4.67
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	3		4.75	758/1574		4.60	4.64		4.75
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	712/1554	4.25	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.25
		Lecture		_		_	_	_										
		uctor's lecture		-	10	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1488		4.65	4.47	4.47	****
		ctor seem inter			10	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1493		4.86	4.73	4.70	****
				xplained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/1486		4.63	4.32	4.32	****
		es contribute to			11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/1489		4.67	4.32	4.34	****
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	4.11	****
_		Semina	=			_		_	_		_							
5. Were	criteria :	for grading made	e clear		9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	4.12	5.00
		0.15																
	. 1	Self			0	0	•	_	•	_	2	F 00	1 / 200	F 00	1 00	4 00	4 0 4	F 00
5. Were t	tnere eno	ugh proctors for	r all ti	ne students	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00
				D		- D-1	a 1a											
				Frequ	iency	DIS	tribi	ltloi	1									
Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	ior		1	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1			1			,	_	_		_	-	5	_	·
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				4	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0													5	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
01 00.	ŭ	3.33 1.30	-	P 0								_	respons				_	,
				I O		O+1	her					6	1 COP OND		91		-	
				5 0		001						~						
				. 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Course-Section: MUSC 307C 0101

JAZZ WORKSHOP

BELZER, MATTHEW

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Page 1158 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Stude	ent Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-------	------------	------------	---------------

			Fre	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	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.20	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	4.23	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00
Fram	enas	Diet	-rih	1+ 1 01	2									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	des Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 307F 0101 University of Maryland Page 1159 JUL 2, 2009 PERCUSSION Baltimore County Spring 2009 GOLDSTEIN, THOM Job IRBR3029 7

Ctudent	Course	Fralustion	Ouestionnaire
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnarie

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

		Ouestion	a		MB	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	-		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	541/1576	4.57	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.57
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	515/1576	4.57	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.57
		estions reflec			0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.75	4.32	4.30	****
		ations reflect			0	4	0	0	0	1	2		339/1520	4.67	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.67
	_	_		what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	0		****/1465	****	4.45	4.12	4.09	****
		_		to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	1	0		****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****
		system clearl		ained	0	3	0	0	0	1	3		238/1547		4.43	4.19		4.75
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	3	4		1025/1574		4.60	4.64		4.57
9. How	would you g	grade the overa	II tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1554	4.80	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.80
		Lectur																
		ctor's lecture			3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.50
		tor seem inter			3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	908/1493		4.86	4.73	4.70	4.75
		-		explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50			4.63	4.32		4.50
		s contribute t			3	0	0	0	0	2		4.50	696/1489		4.67	4.32		4.50
5. Did	audiovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	4.11	****
		Discus																
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0		4.33	603/1279		4.47	4.17		4.33
				ed to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.42	5.00
				nd open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.71	4.35		4.67
4. Were	e special te	chniques succe	ssiul		4	1	0	U	1	1	0	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	4.65	4.05	4.09	3.50
		Semina			_				•		_	- 00			4 56	4 0 1	4 40	
5. Were	e criteria f	or grading mad	e clear	•	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****
E 543	6	Field			_	0	0	0	0	0	0	F 00	1 / 200	F 00	4 00	4 02	4 02	F 00
5. Dia	conierences	s neip you carr	y out i	field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	4.23	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	ı									
Credits	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 5		Rec	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-									, ,		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	1
84-150) 1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
				T 0		0+1						_			_			

Other

6

I 0

1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: MUSC 307G 0101 Title COLLEGIUM Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH 7

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

Page 1160 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			_							_			_ ,	
			Fre	-	ncies	5	_		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	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.60	4.03	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.41	5.00
	-	0	_	_	_	_	-	- 00	1 / 000	F 00	4 65	4 0 5	4 00	- 00

Frequency Distribution

4. Were special techniques successful 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/878 5.00 4.65 4.05 4.09 5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	rades 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	2	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 307H 0101 Title SAXOPHONE Instructor: BELZER, MATTHEW Spring 2009 Enrollment: 2

Page 1161 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	2	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 you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1445/1576	3.50	4.62	4.30	4.30	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.11	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	4.12	5.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	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		Red		ed fo	or Ma	iors		0	Graduat	 e	0	Maic	 r	2

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

Course-Section: MUSC 307K 0101

Title VOCAL ARTS ENSEMBLE

Instructor: KING, THOMAS

Enrollment: 10
Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1162 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	1															
1. Did v	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1241/1576	3.90	4.62	4.30	4.30	3.90
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	1	5	3		1138/1576		4.69	4.27	4.28	4.00
		uestions reflec			0	8	0	0	0	2	0		****/1342		4.75	4.32	4.30	****
		uations reflect			0	6	0	0	0	2	2	4.50			4.68	4.25		4.50
				what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	1		****/1465		4.45	4.12	4.09	****
	_	-		to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	0		****/1434		4.61	4.14	4.15	****
		g system clearl			0	2	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1239/1547	3.75	4.43	4.19	4.21	3.75
		was class cand			0	1	0	0	0	6			1262/1574		4.60	4.64	4.61	4.33
				ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5			1081/1554					3.88
	Lecture																	
1 Warra	the insta			nyonovod	٥	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/1488	****	1 6E	4.47	4.47	****
	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared . Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	0		****/1493		4.86	4.47	4.47	****
				explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	1	-		****/1486		4.63	4.73	4.70	***
		cerial presence es contribute t			9	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1489		4.63		4.34	***
				your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	1	•		****/1277		4.60			
		1		,									•					
F		Semina	_		0	0	0	0	0	0	-	F 00	**** / 205	de de de de	4 56	4 01	4 10	de de de de
5. Were	criteria :	for grading mad	le clea	r	9	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****
		Field	Work															
5. Did c	onference	s help you carr	y out	field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	4.23	5.00
		Self	Paced															
5. Were	there eno	ugh proctors fo		the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00
	The					7 Dist	- wib	.+ : 0:	_									
				riequ	rency	/ DIS	LIID	10101	11									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 3	2	 Graduat	 е	0	Majo	or	8
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0						-			•						, ,			
56-83 2 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	2

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				2	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 307L 0101 University of Maryland Title COLLABORATIVE PIANO

FRANKLIN, RACHE

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1163

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 6 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions						NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did you	ı dəin ne	w insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4 17	1042/1576	4.17	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.17
-	_	tor make clear			0	0	0	2	0	0	4		1138/1576		4.69	4.27	4.28	4.00
		estions reflec		_	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	972/1342		4.75	4.32	4.30	4.00
		ations reflect			0	0	1	1	0	0	4		1212/1520		4.68	4.25	4.25	3.83
				what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	0			1242/1465		4.45	4.12	4.09	3.50
				o what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.61	4.14	4.15	4.25
7. Was the	grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	2	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1239/1547	3.75	4.43	4.19	4.21	3.75
8. How man	y times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.33
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.52	4.10	4.09	3.50
		Lecture																
		ctor's lecture			2	0	0	1	0	1	2		1233/1488		4.65	4.47	4.47	4.00
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	2	2		1210/1493	4.50	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.50
				explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	0			1253/1486		4.63	4.32	4.32	3.75
		s contribute to			2	0	0	2	0	0			1313/1489	3.50	4.67	4.32	4.34	3.50
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	2	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.60	4.03	4.11	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ate to	what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1146/1279	3.25	4.47	4.17	4.20	3.25
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.69	4.35	4.42	4.50
				nd open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1036/1269	3.75	4.71	4.35	4.41	3.75
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful		2	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	4.65	4.05	4.09	3.67
		Semina																
5. Were cr	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear	•	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****
		Field																
5. Did con	nferences	help you carr	y out f	ield activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.23	****
		Self																
	_	-		what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.84	4.60	4.83	****
		ions make clea			5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.90	4.83	4.89	****
		cts with the in			5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	***	4.84	4.67	5.00	****
		k/tutoring by	_	_	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 28	****	4.83	4.78	5.00	
5. Were th	nere enou	gh proctors fo	r all t	ne students	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00
	Fr								1									
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Re	quir	ed fo	or Ma	 ajors		0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83 84-150	2 1	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0 1	C 0 D 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	-major	5
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### -				_	ιh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
I 0 ? 1						Ot]	her					3						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: MUSC 308 0101

29

UMBC WIND ENSEMBLE

VILLANUEVA, JAR

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 28

Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1164 JUL 2, 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
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	23	0	1	0	2	2	0	2 00	****/1576	****	4.62	4.30	4.30	****
	23	0	1	0	1	1	2		****/1576		4.62	4.27	4.28	****
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	23	0	0	0	0	4			****/1574				4.28	****
8. How many times was class cancelled		-	-	-	-	4	J		, -		4.60	4.64		****
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	0	0	0	0	Τ	3	4.75	****/1554	****	4.52	4.10	4.09	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.47	***
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1493		4.86	4.73	4.70	***
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1486		4.63	4.32	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1489		4.67	4.32	4.34	****
1. Did the rectares contribute to what you rearned	20	O	O	O	U	_	_	1.50	/ 1100		1.07	1.52	1.51	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.20	***
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.42	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.41	****
4. Were special techniques successful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.09	****
		-	-	-	-	_	-		,					
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.23	****
5. 21d conferences mer jed carry out freid detrified		O	3	3	3	3	5	3.00	, 520		,0	1.05	1.23	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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						

Course-Section: MUSC 309 0101

Title UMBC NEW MUSIC ENSEMBL

Instructor: SMITH, STUART S

Enrollment:

11 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1165 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

			Frequence											or Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect	
			Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
			Genera	 1															
1.	Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	712/1576	4.45	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.45
2.	Did th	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	920/1576	4.27	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.27
3.	Did th	e exam qu	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00
4.	Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	179/1520	4.83	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.83
5.	Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ate to	what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	5.00
6.	Did wr	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1434	****	4.61	4.14	4.15	****
7.	Was th	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	0	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.75
			was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.61	5.00
9.	How wo	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	682/1554	4.29	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.29
			Lecture	e															
1.	Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1488	****	4.65	4.47	4.47	****
2.	Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1493	****	4.86	4.73	4.70	****
3.	Was le	cture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1486	****	4.63	4.32	4.32	****
4.	Did th	e lecture	s contribute to	what	you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	****	4.67	4.32	4.34	****
5.	Did au	diovisual	techniques en	nance y	our understanding	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	4.11	****
			Discus	sion															
1.	Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ate to	what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.20	****
2.	Were a	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	d to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.42	****
3.	Did th	e instruc	tor encourage :	fair an	d open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.41	****
4.	Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful	-	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	***	4.65	4.05	4.09	***
			Semina	r															
5.	Were c	riteria f	or grading mad	_		10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****
			Field 1	a l .															
5.	Did co	nferences			ield activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	***	4.98	4.03	4.23	****
				•		-		_	-	-	-	_		,					
5	Were t	here enou	Self : gh proctors fo		he students	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 382	5 00	4 96	4 08	4 24	5.00
٥.	WCIC C	nere enou	gii proceorb ro.	L GIL C							Ü	•	3.00	1, 302	3.00	1.50	1.00	1.21	3.00
					Frequ	lency	Dist	rib	utior	1									
Cre	dits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Ту	pe			Majors	
0.0	-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	7
	-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-									3 -		
56	-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	4
84	-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									3				-	
Gr	ad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
					P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
					I 0		Oth	ner					6						

Course-Section: MUSC 319 0101 University of Maryland Title ADV TOPICS IN MUSIC TE WONNEBERGER, AL

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 9

Page 1166 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Questions			NR	NA		_	ncies	4	5		ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.63
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.75
		estions reflect			1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.75
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the exp	ected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.75
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	231/1465	4.71	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.71
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contri	ibute to	what you learn	ed 1	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	226/1434	4.71	4.61	4.14	4.15	4.71
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.75
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.75
9. How wor	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach	ing effectivene	ss 4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1554	4.80	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.80
		Lecture	е															
1. Were th	ne instru	actor's lectures	s well p	repared	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.67
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.67
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	d and ex	plained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned				3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.67
5. Did aud	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				g 5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277	4.75	4.60	4.03	4.11	4.75
		Discus	sion															
				hat you learned		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.20	5.00
				to participate				0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.42	5.00
				open discussion				0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.09	****
		Self 1																
5. Were th	nere enou	igh proctors for	r all th	e students	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	4.24	****
				Fr	equenc	y Di	strik	outic	n									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Re	asons	5			ТУ	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4					 R	 equir	ed f	or Ma		 5	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 1			1				-	-		-	-) •		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		G	enera	al				0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		_							5				3	-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Elective						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ıh
				P 0		Electives							respons				_	
				I 0		Other						6	_		5			
				? 0	Other													

Course-Section: MUSC 322 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County MUSIC HISTORY II Instructor: MORIN, JOSEPH

Spring 2009

Page 1167

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 26 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions						eque					tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect	
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did vou	ı gain ne	ew insights,skills fr	om this course	1	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	347/1576	4.72	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.72
		ctor make clear the e		2	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75			4.69	4.27	4.28	4.75
		uestions reflect the		2	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	197/1342		4.75	4.32	4.30	4.88
		uations reflect the e		2	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58			4.68	4.25	4.25	4.58
		eadings contribute to		2	1	1	0	1	4	17	4.57	328/1465	4.57	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.57
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contribute	to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	296/1434	4.64	4.61	4.14	4.15	4.64
7. Was the	grading	g system clearly expl	ained	2	0	0	1	2	3	18	4.58	434/1547	4.58	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.58
8. How man	ny times	was class cancelled		3	0	0	0	0	17	6	4.26	1317/1574	4.26	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.26
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	1	9	7	4.22	742/1554	4.22	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.22
		Lecture															
1. Were th	ne instru	uctor's lectures well	prepared	13	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	834/1488	4.54	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.54
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem interested	in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	888/1493	4.77	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.77
3. Was led	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl					0	1	1	2	9	4.46	735/1486	4.46	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.46
4. Did the	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	1	0	4	8	4.46	742/1489	4.46	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.46
5. Did aud	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					0	1	2	3	6	4.17	608/1277	4.17	4.60	4.03	4.11	4.17
1. Did cla	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					1	1	0	0	4	3.83	****/1279	****	4.47	4.17	4.20	****
		nts actively encourage	-	21	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	****/1270	***	4.69	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	21	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.41	***
		echniques successful	-	21	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.09	****
		Seminar															
5. Were cr	riteria 1	for grading made clea	r	24	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	4.12	****
		Field Work															
5. Did con	nferences	s help you carry out	field activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.98	4.03	4.23	****
		Self Paced															
5. Were th	nere enou	ugh proctors for all	the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4.08	4.24	****
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Re	ason	ıs			Ту	pe			Majors	;		
00-27	0-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 11				Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 Iajor	 ŝ	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	22
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	в 10			-			_						3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	26	Non-	-major	4
84-150												3				-	
Grad.					El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ſh
			P 0									respons				_	
			I 0		Ot:	her				2	12	_					
? 0																	

Course-Section: MUSC 323 0101 University of Maryland Title CAREEER DEV FOR MUSICI Baltimore County

Instructor: CELLA, LISA

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 16

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

Ι

?

0

0

2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland Page 1168
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

6

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

		Questions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	-	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Di	d	rain nor	General insights,skil		m this source	1	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.40
		-	tor make clear			1	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	568/1576	4.53	4.62	4.27	4.28	4.53
			estions reflect		1 3	1	7	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	735/1342	4.38	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.38
		_	ations reflect			1	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.50
					what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	347/1465	4.53	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.53
	-	-	-		to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	226/1434		4.61	4.14		4.71
			system clearly		-	1	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.57
	-	, ,	was class cance	_	.11104	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	702/1574		4.60	4.64		4.79
	_				hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	395/1554		4.52	4.10		4.50
			Lecture																
1 Wa	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	822/1488	4.55	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.55
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	966/1493	4.73	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.73
					explained clearly	5 5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	749/1486	4.45	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.45
			s contribute to			5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	649/1489	4.55	4.67	4.32	4.34	
					our understanding	5	6	0	0	0	1	-	4.80	132/1277	4.80	4.60	4.03		4.80
			Discuss																
1 Di	d aloa				what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.47	4.17	4.20	4.67
					ed to participate	10	0	0	0	1	2	_	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.69	4.35	4.42	4.33
			-	_	d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	353/1269	4.83	4.71	4.35	4.41	4.83
			chniques succes		d open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.65	4.05	4.09	4.50
					_		<u> </u>	.,											
	Fi						7 Dist	crib	utioi	1									
Credi	ts Earr	ned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-2	 :7	0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6					Rec	uir	ed fo	or Ma	 aior	 `S	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	10
28-5		0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2										-	-) 0		
56-8		0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	6
84-1	.50	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				-	

Electives

Other

Course-Section: MUSC 385 0101

Title INTERMEDIATE CONDUCTIN

Instructor: MCCOY, MARK

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1169 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			General															
1 D	id voi	gain n	ew insights, skills	from this course	5	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.67
			ctor make clear the		5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	256/1576		4.69	4.27	4.28	4.78
			uestions reflect the		5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	406/1342		4.75	4.32	4.30	4.67
		_	uations reflect the	_	5	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	453/1520		4.68	4.25	4.25	4.56
			eadings contribute		5	1	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	778/1465		4.45	4.12	4.09	4.13
		_	_	e to what you learned	5	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	345/1434	4.57	4.61	4.14	4.15	4.57
7. Wa	as the	gradin	g system clearly ex	olained	5	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.00
8. Ho	ow mar	y times	was class cancelled	E	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.67
9. Ho	ow wou	ıld you	grade the overall to	eaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	805/1554	4.17	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.17
			Lecture															
1. We	ere th	ne instr	uctor's lectures we	ll prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.80
	id the instructor seem interested in the subject as lecture material presented and explained clear?				9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00
	id the lectures contribute to what you learned				9	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	561/1486		4.63	4.32	4.32	4.60
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				9	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	579/1489		4.67	4.32	4.34	4.60
5. Di	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1277	****	4.60	4.03	4.11	****
			ussions contribute		12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1279	***	4.47	4.17	4.20	****
			nts actively encour		12	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/1270	****	4.69	4.35	4.42	****
				and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/1269	****	4.71	4.35	4.41	****
4. We	ere sp	ecial t	echniques successfu	L	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.09	****
			Seminar					•		•			4 / 055			4 0 0	4 40	
5. We	ere cr	riteria	for grading made cl	ear	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	4.12	5.00
F 5		-	Field Work		•	0	•	0	0	0	-	F 00	1 / 206	F 00	4 00	4 00	4 00	F 00
5. Di	ia con	irerence	s help you carry ou	t field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	4.23	5.00
E Wa	owo +h		Self Paceough proctors for al		13	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 382	****	4.96	4 00	4.24	****
5. We	ere u	iere eno	ugii proctors for all	r the students	13	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	/ 302		4.90	4.00	4.24	
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credi	its Ea	rned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-2	00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4					Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	 5	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	9
28-5	55	0	1.00-1.99 0	в 0			-			-								
56-8	83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.4	Non-	major	5
84-1	150	2	3.00-3.49 0	D 0														
Grad	d.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					ŗh
				P 0								respons	es to k	e sign	ifican	ıt		
				I 0	Other					5								
				? 0														

Course-Section	n: MUSC 390B 0201	University of Maryland	Page 1170
Title	VOICE	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	JACKSON, JANICE	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	2		

Questionnaires:	2	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Ouestions				Fre	quer	cies	5		Instr		Course	_		Level	Sect
) 	Questions 		NR	NA 	1 	2 	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insig	course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.33	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make	l goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.33	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled				0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	4.50	4.60	4.64	4.61	5.00
	Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	tion	1										
Credits Earned (Cum. GPA Exp	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	; 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	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 390B 0301 University of Maryland Title VOICE Baltimore County

Questionnaires: 1

Page 1171 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Instructor: KING, THOMAS Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 1

Student	('Ollrge	H'772	liiation	Question	naire

) TO				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	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.33	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.33	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.68	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.61	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.65	4.47	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1493	4.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.67	4.32	4.34	4.00

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	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	-	_		
				2	Λ						

Course-Section	n: MUSC 390B 0401	University of Maryland	Page 1172
Title	VOICE	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	MYDKUMTCDDYKYCH	Spring 2009	Tob TDBD3020

Title VOICE Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: MARKOVICPRAKASH Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 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	1	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.33	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.33	4.69	4.27	4.28	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.50	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	4.00

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	1	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 390D 0101 University of Maryland
Title VIOLA Baltimore County
Instructor: LAMBROS, MARIA Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

2

University of Maryland Page 1173
Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009
Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies				ructor	Course	_		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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.11	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons	Type			Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	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	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other	2	-				
				2	0							

Course-Section:	MUSC 390S 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1174
Title	PERCUSSION	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	GOLDSTEIN, THOM	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1			
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	L	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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section	n: MUSC 390X 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1175
Title	SENIOR PROJECT	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	LAGANA, TOM	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	2		

Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnair	Questionnaires:	1	Student Co	Course	Evaluation	Questionnair
--	-----------------	---	------------	--------	------------	--------------

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	eque	ncie:	s 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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1148/1576	4.67	4.62	4.30	4.30	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.61	4.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	4.24	5.00
	Frequency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gr	ades			Rea	ason	s 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	ns 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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 390X 0101
Title SENIOR PROJECT
Instructor: RICHARDS, E.M.
Enrollment: 2

Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1176 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					Instructor		uctor	-		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	1/1576	4.67	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.11	5.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.98	4.03	4.23	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 390X 0101
Title SENIOR PROJECT
Instructor: CELLA, LISA
Enrollment: 2

Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1177 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	-					Instru	actor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.67	4.62	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.28	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.11	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.41	5.00

Credits E	Credits Earned		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	2	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	Electives 0 #### - Mea		ans there are not		ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 390X 0101
Title SENIOR PROJECT
Instructor: SMITH, DAVID
Enrollment: 2

Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1178 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Course-Section: MUSC 400 0101

4

SPECIAL PROJECTS

GOLDSTEIN, TOM

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Page 1179 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student.	('Ollivea	H'377	luation	()IIAGEIO	nnaira

	Frequencies				Instructor		ructor	-				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	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.69	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.38	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	4.33	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	287/ 375	3.00	4.76	4.01	3.90	3.00

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

Course-Section	: MUSC 400 0601	University of Maryland	Page 1180
Title	SPECIAL PROJECTS	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	WANENCHAK, L	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029

Instructor: WANENCHAK, L Spring 2009 Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies				Instr	uctor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.50	4.61	4.14	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.24	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.88	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades Reasons Type			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	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 400 0801
Title SPECIAL PROJECTS
Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.

2

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1181 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Eval	luation 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	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1465	4.50	4.45	4.12	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.50	4.61	4.14	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.50	4.43	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.67	4.60	4.64	4.69	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.38	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades		Expected Gra		Reasons	Reasons			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	ı		
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant			
				I	0	Other	1	-	-				
				?	0								

Course-Section: MUSC 401 0101 University of Maryland Page 1182 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Title SPECIAL PROJECTS: COMP Baltimore County Spring 2009 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNA I.

Enrollment:	2	
Ougstienneimes:	2	Ctudont

Enrollment:	2
Ouestionnaires:	2

- ·				
Ctudont	('Ollivea	Evaluation	Olipetio	nnaira

							Frequencies Instru			ructor	ructor Course Dept			Level	Sect			
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		Genera	.1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.35	5.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute 1	to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	4.30	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.52	4.10	4.24	4.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.31	5.0
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.0
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion				1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.55	5.0	
		Self	Paced															
l. Did se	lf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.84	4.60	5.00	5.0
3. Were y	our conta	acts with the i	nstruc	or helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.84	4.67	5.00	5.0
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Re	 quir	ed f	or Ma	ijor	 s	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	 or	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-									3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0			Under-g	rad	2	Non-	-major	1					
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-	
Grad.	Frad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0			El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ſh		
				P 0									respons				_	
				I O		Ot	her					2	-					
				? 1														

Course-Section: MUSC 417 0101 University of Maryland Title SPEC TPCS IN MUSC TECH Baltimore County Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL

Spring 2009

Page 1183

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	7			
Questionnaires:	7	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					1					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
	Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	Gener	 al															
1. Did you ga	ain new insights,sk	ills fro	m this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the in	structor make clea	r the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.35	5.00
	cam questions refle		1 3	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1342		4.75	4.32	4.46	5.00
	evaluations reflec			1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did assign	ned readings contri	bute to	what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	4.30	5.00
	rading system clear		ined	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.24	5.00
	Lectu	re															
1. Were the	instructor's lectur	es well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.86	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lectur	re material present	ed and e	xplained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.63	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did the le	ectures contribute	to what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audio	risual techniques e	nhance y	our understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.04	5.00
	Discu	ssion															
1. Did class	discussions contri	bute to	what vou learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.31	5.00
	students actively e		-	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
	structor encourage			5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.55	5.00
	lal techniques succ		-	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.65	4.05	4.33	****
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ıtioı	n									
			-														
Credits Earne	ed Cum. GP.	A 	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту]	pe 			Majors	;
	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	4
28-55	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	3
84-150 1 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	re not	enoug	jh
			P 0									responses to be significant			nt		
I 0					Otl	her					1						
? 0																	

Course-Section: MUSC 418 0101	University of Maryland	Page 1
Title MUSIC TECH. INTERNSHIP	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2

1184 2009

Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	4			-	
Questionnaires:	4	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.69	4.27	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals			0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.75	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.61	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.43	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.24	5.00	

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

Course-Section: MUSC 480 0101

Title TOPICS IN MUSC/ART/SOC

Instructor: BECK, GINA C

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1185 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rai	nk	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1																
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights,ski		m this course	5	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1325/	1576	3.80	4.62	4.30	4.46	3.80
_	_	tor make clear			5	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1076/	1576	4.10	4.69	4.27	4.35	4.10
3. Did th	ne exam que	estions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	240/	1342	4.80	4.75	4.32	4.46	4.80
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	5	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	683/1	1520	4.40	4.68	4.25	4.38	4.40
5. Did as	signed rea	adings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	5	5	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	708/	1465	4.20	4.45	4.12	4.22	4.20
6. Did wr	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1063/	1434	3.80	4.61	4.14	4.30	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1159/	1547	3.89	4.43	4.19	4.24	3.89
8. How ma	8. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/3	1574	4.80	4.60	4.64	4.69	4.80
9. How wo	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teach	hing effectiveness	9	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1367/	1554	3.33	4.52	4.10	4.24	3.33
		Lectur	e																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	6	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	1048/	1488	4.33	4.65	4.47	4.55	4.33
		tor seem inter			6	0	1	0	0	0	8		1167/		4.56	4.86	4.73	4.80	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1286/	1486	3.67	4.63	4.32	4.41	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1057/	1489	4.11	4.67	4.32	4.38	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	506/1	1277	4.29	4.60	4.03	4.04	4.29
		Discus	gion																
1 Did cl	agg digcu			what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	1	3 50	1064/	1279	3.50	4.47	4.17	4.31	3.50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	1	0	0	2	1		1135/		3.50	4.69	4.35	4.53	3.50
				d open discussion	11 11	0	1	0	0	1	2		1036/		3.75	4.71	4.35	4.55	3.75
		chniques succe		a open arboabbion	11	2	0	0	1	0			****/		****	4.65	4.05		****
		Semina:																	
1 Were a	esigned to			announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	85	****	****	4.72	4.77	****
				ividual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	79	****	****	4.69	4.69	****
				what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	72	****	****	4.64	4.64	****
	_	ns contribute		_	14	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/	80	****	****	4.61	4.52	****
		or grading made		you rearried	11	0	0	0	1	0	3		152/		4.50	4.76	4.01		4.50
E Did ao	nforongog	Field I		ield activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1 /	326	5.00	4.98	1 02	3.97	E 00
5. Dia co	niter ences	neip you carr	y Out I.	ieid activities	10	U	U	U	U	U	5	5.00	1/	320	5.00	4.90	4.03	3.91	5.00
	•	Self											,						
5. Were t	here enoug	gh proctors for	r all th	ne students	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/	382	****	4.96	4.08	3.88	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	utior	ı										
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons					Tyr	oe .			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	\$	0	Grad	duate	9	0	Majo	or	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		_		,				0			, -	_			_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	neral	T				0	Unde	er-gi	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	9
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0								0	p n 20						.1.
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0					U	#### - Means there are not enor			_	lu				
P 0									s significant										
				I 0		Other					6								

0

Course-Section: MUSC 492 0101 University of Maryland Title SENIOR PROJECT Baltimore County Instructor: WONNEBERGER, AL Spring 2009

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

4

Baltimore County
Spring 2009

Page 1186 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnair	Р

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.62	4.30	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1576		4.69	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3		1/1342		4.75	4.32	4.46	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1520	5.00	4.68	4.25	4.38	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.45	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434		4.61	4.14	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.75	4.43	4.19	4.24	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.60	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.52	4.10	4.24	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.65	4.47	4.55	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493		4.86	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1486		4.63	4.32	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.03	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.47	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.71	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.65	4.05	4.33	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.84	4.60	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.90	4.83	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.84	4.67	5.00	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.83	4.78	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.96	4.08	3.88	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

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