Course-Section: MUSC 101 01 Title

Fundamentals Music Thr

Instructor: Richards, Kazuko

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 9

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 982 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	287/1447	4.42	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1447	4.61	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	496/1241	4.62	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	437/1402	4.45	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	529/1358	4.11	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.62	4.14	3.99	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	971/1427	4.27	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	4.99	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	141/1434	4.38	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	626/1387	4.51	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	919/1387	4.82	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	879/1386	4.33	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	520/1380	4.57	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	82/1193	4.30	4.68	4.02	3.99	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	710/1172	3.84	4.72	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	490/1182	4.14	4.83	4.35	4.18	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	798/1170	4.19	4.78	4.38	4.17	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****

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

Course-Section: MUSC 101 02

Fundamentals Music Thr

Title Instructor: Hawley JR, Thoma

Enrollment: 89 Questionnaires: 49

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 983 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	- <del>-</del>				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	2	1	11	13	22	4.06	1027/1447	4.42	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	16	28	4.45	619/1447	4.61	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	9	36	4.69	357/1241	4.62	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	32	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	665/1402	4.45	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	15	3	0	7	12	12	3.88	931/1358	4.11	4.53	4.11	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	38	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	****/1316	4.67	4.62	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	6	7	33	4.53	422/1427	4.27	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	48	4.98	146/1447	4.99	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	3	0	0	10	18	9	3.97	889/1434	4.38	4.64	4.10	4.10	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Λ	0	Λ	3	4	13	29	4.39	921/1387	4.51	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	Λ	4	45	4.92	475/1387	4.82	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	14	28	4.41	748/1386		4.77	4.32	4.32	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	13	30	4.52	637/1380	4.57	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	13	3	2	8	9	12	3.74	855/1193	4.30	4.68	4.02	3.99	3.74
1														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	1	6	6	7	3.68	914/1172	3.84	4.72	4.15	3.95	3.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	0	6	4	3	9	3.68	1032/1182	4.14	4.83	4.35	4.18	3.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	1	4	7	10	4.18	804/1170	4.19	4.78	4.38	4.17	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	28	11	2	1	4	0	3	3.10	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	43	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	14	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	33	Under-grad	49	Non-major	49
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				?	3						

Course-Section: MUSC 111 01 University of Maryland Musicianship Lab II

Questionnaires: 15

Grad.

3.50-4.00

F

Ρ

0

0

0

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 984

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title Instructor: Pollauf, Jacquel Spring 2010 Enrollment: 18

			Frequencies			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	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	723/1447	4.53	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected		0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	196/1447	4.90	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected	-	0	2	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1241	4.96	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected		0	1	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	186/1402	4.89	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what yo		0	10	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what		0	9	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	239/1316	4.83	4.62	4.14	3.99	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	513/1427	4.55	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	1	4	7	3		1414/1447	3.53	4.63	4.69	4.68	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching ef	fectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	5	4		408/1434		4.64	4.10	4.10	4.44
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepare		9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1387	4.94	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the s	_	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	707/1387	4.73	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explaine	-	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1386	4.94	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you lea		9	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	463/1380	4.77	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your und	lerstanding	10	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1193	4.80	4.68	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what yo	u learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	4.80	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to pa	rticipate	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	4.83	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open	discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	4.50	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful		12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	3.67	4.85	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the m	atorial	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	E 00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background		14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab		14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly s	necified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
5. Note requirements for tab reports creating s	pecifica		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 100			1.20	1.25	
	Freque	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade					Rea	sons				Туј	pe			Majors	1
	A 11	Required for Majors 1				4	Graduate	9	0	Majo	r	14			
	В 2	Company				_		_	_			_			
	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	1
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1	D 0														

Electives

Other

0

0

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2010

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

Page 985 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	13	
Questionnaires:	12	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ρ

I

0

0

0

Course-Section: MUSC 111 02

Musicianship Lab II

Questions

Pollauf, Jacquel

Title

Instructor:

						1421						rican	Rom	ricari	rican	rican	rican	rican
		Genera																
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	408/1447	4.53	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.67
2. Did the	e instruc	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	4.90	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	127/1241	4.96	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.92
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1402	4.89	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1316	4.83	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	310/1427	4.55	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.64
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	9	3	0	3.25	1437/1447	3.53	4.63	4.69	4.68	3.25
9. How wou	uld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	397/1434	4.45	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.45
		Lectur	0															
1 Were th	he instru	nrenared	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	245/1387	4 94	4.74	4 46	4.46	4.88		
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	1	1	6		1030/1387	4.73	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.63
	<ol> <li>Was lecture material presented and explained clearl</li> </ol>							0	0	1	7		171/1386	4.94		4.32	4.32	4.88
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	1	7		193/1380	4.77	4.80	4.32	4.31	
				our understanding	4	0 3	0	0	0	1		4.80	,	4.80		4.02		
3. 21d dd	410112441	000111114000 011	1101100 /		-		ŭ	Ü	ŭ	-	-	1.00	100,110	1.00	1.00	1.02	3.77	1.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	323/1172	4.80	4.72	4.15	3.95	4.60
				ed to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	430/1182	4.83	4.83	4.35	4.18	4.67
		_	_	d open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	864/1170	4.50	4.78	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful	-	7	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	612/ 800	3.67	4.85	4.06	3.95	3.67
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons	5			Тур	e			Majors	1
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 A 7	Required for Majors					 a 1	2	Graduate		0	 Majo		11	
28-55	<i>3</i>	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	Required for Majors					o 1	. 4	Graduate	-	U	Ma JO	_	TT	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General						0	Under-gr	ad 1	2	Non-	major	1	
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	General						•	onder gr	1	_	1,011		_	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives					0	#### - M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	rh		
craa.	•	3.33 1.00	-	_ 0	Electives					•	11 11 11 11 1		u		caroug			

Other

0

Course-Section: MUSC 112 02 University of Maryland Title Music Repertoire Baltimore County Instructor: Yoshioka, Airi Spring 2010

Questions

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

4

Page 986 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

St.udent.	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

		 Genera																	
1 Did voi	ı dəin r	genera new insights,ski	_	m this course		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
		ictor make clear				0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
		questions reflec				0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00		4.33	4.25	5.00
		uations reflect				0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74		4.15	5.00
				what you learned		0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
	_	-		o what you learn		0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
		ng system clearl				0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	5.00		4.19	4.24	5.00
		was class canc				0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.50
				ching effectivene	ss	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture																			
1. Were th	he instr	cuctor's lecture	s well	prepared		2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
		ctor seem inter				2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearl						0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					g	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1193	5.00		4.02	3.99	5.00
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cla	ass disc			what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
				ed to participate		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
				nd open discussio		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial t	echniques succe	ssful	_		0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00
				Fr	equer	ncy	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Ea	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grad	.es				Rea	sons	5 			Тур	e 			Majors	; 
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4			Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	2	Graduate	<u> </u>	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		•													
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		General							0	Under-gr	ad	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	#### - M					jh	
				P 0							response	s to b	e sign	ifican	ıt				
				I 0			Oth	ıer					1						
				? 0															

Course-Section: MUSC 126 01 University of Maryland Page 987 Title Theory II:Form&Analysi Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Spring 2010

Job IRBR3029

Title Theory II:Form&Analysi
Instructor: Dusman,Linda J

Instructor: Dusma Enrollment: 25

Questionnaires: 19 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fro	_	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General	0	0	1	1	2	2	10	1 26	050/1447	1 11	4 75	1 21	4 10	1 20
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	⊿	12 11	4.26	859/1447 728/1447	4.41 4.46	4.75 4.78	4.31 4.27	4.18	4.26 4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	- 4	13	4.72	313/1241	4.46	4.76	4.33	4.25	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	402/1402		4.74	4.24	4.15	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	1	12	4.21			4.53	4.11	4.03	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		4	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	434/1316		4.62	4.14	3.99	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	. 0	0	3	1	6	3	6		1284/1427		4.53	4.19	4.24	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	5		1246/1447		4.63	4.69	4.68	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	-	1	0	0	1	8	3				4.64	4.10		4.17
7. now would you grade the overall teaching critectiveness		_	O	U	_	U	3	1.1/	755/1151	1.00	1.01	1.10	1.10	1.1/
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	414/1387	4.55	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	422/1387	4.91	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	663/1386		4.77	4.32	4.32	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	534/1380		4.80	4.32	4.31	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	1	0	1	1	1	- 8	4.45	332/1193		4.68	4.02	3.99	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	339/1172	4.57	4.72	4.15	3.95	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	440/1170	4.71	4.78	4.38	4.17	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00
Freq	uency	/ Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 11		Required for Majors 15						Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	17	
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 4			_			-						_		
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 1		Ge	enera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	2
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0									_				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 7 F 0		Electives				0	#### - :	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh		
P 0							respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt			
I 0		Ot	ther					1						
? 1														

Course-Section: MUSC 126 02 University of Maryland Title Theory II:Form&Analysi Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Rubin,Anna I

Enrollment: 13 Ouestionnaires: 9

# Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 988

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 529/1447 4.41 4.75 4.31 4.18 4.56 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 479/1447 4.46 4.78 4.27 4.30 4.56 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 7 4.78 261/1241 4.75 4.84 4.33 4.25 4.78 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 4 5 4.56 437/1402 4.57 4.74 4.24 4.15 4.56 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 2 2 4 4.25 608/1358 4.23 4.53 4.11 4.03 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 0 1 0 0 5 4.50 392/1316 4.48 4.62 4.14 3.99 4.50 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 6 1 3.89 1090/1427 3.65 4.53 4.19 4.24 3.89 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 8 1 4.11 1326/1447 4.19 4.63 4.69 4.68 4.11 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  $1 \quad 0 \quad 0$ 0 0 8 0 4.00 849/1434 4.08 4.64 4.10 4.10 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 6 3 4.33 970/1387 4.55 4.74 4.46 4.46 4.33 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 579/1387 4.91 4.92 4.73 4.71 4.89 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 4 4 4.50 607/1386 4.48 4.77 4.32 4.32 4.50 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 3 6 4.67 463/1380 4.64 4.80 4.32 4.31 4.67 0 0 0 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 2 0 2 5 4.11 602/1193 4.28 4.68 4.02 3.99 4.11 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1172 4.57 4.72 4.15 3.95 \*\*\*\* 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1182 5.00 4.83 4.35 4.18 \*\*\*\* 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1170 4.71 4.78 4.38 4.17 \*\*\*\* Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 163 01
Title Diction: German
Instructor: King, Thomas D.

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 989 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	3	_	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Eval	luation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1411/1447	3.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1291/1358	3.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1427/1427	1.00	4.53	4.19	4.24	1.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1443/1447	3.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1349/1434	3.00	4.64	4.10	4.10	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1350/1387	3.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1320/1387	4.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	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	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 170 01 University of Maryland Title Beginning Voice Class Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Page 990

Jackson, Janice Instructor: Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	23				
Ouestionnaires:	15	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnair

84-150

Grad.

2

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

3

3

D

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

1

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	211/1447	4.85	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.85
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	187/1447	4.82	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.82
3. Did the	e exam qı	uestions reflect	t the e	expected goals	3	3	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	611/1241	4.44	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.44
4. Did otl	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	3	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	347/1402	4.64	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.64
5. Did as:	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	2	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1057/1358	3.70	4.53	4.11	4.03	3.70
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	3	2	0	3	3	1	3	3.40	1172/1316	3.40	4.62	4.14	3.99	3.40
7. Was the	Was the grading system clearly explained How many times was class cancelled				3	2	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1077/1427	3.90	4.53	4.19	4.24	3.90
8. How man	How many times was class cancelled				3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How wor	). How would you grade the overall teaching effective				4	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	397/1434	4.45	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.45
	Lecture																	
1. Were tl	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
		ctor seem inter			10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
		es contribute to			10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
				Frequ	lency	, Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Ma					jor	s	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							1	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	major	15

Electives

Other

6

3

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 171 01 University of Maryland Title Intermediate Voice Cla Baltimore County

Instructor: Jackson, Janice

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 14

# Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 991

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies							T 1		G	D t-	TRADA	T 1	Q
			Fre	-		S	_		ructor	Course	_	-	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	Τ	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	474/1447	4.60	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	677/1447	4.40	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	281/1402	4.70	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1156/1316	3.44	4.62	4.14	3.99	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	541/1427	4.44	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	158/1434	4.75	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1386	4.86	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	392/1380	4.71	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	323/1172	4.60	4.72	4.15	3.95	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	327/1170	4.80	4.78	4.38	4.17	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	250/ 800	4.40	4.85	4.06	3.95	4.40
1		Ü	,	·	Ū		_	0			00		2.75	
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	ıtio	n									

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

Course-Section: MUSC 175 01 University of Maryland
Title Intermediate Vocal Met Baltimore County

Title Intermediate Vocal M Instructor: Jackson, Janice

Instructor: Jacks
Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

Spring 2010
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 992

JUN 28, 2010

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 fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor	r make clear the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluat:	ions reflect the e	xpected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
<ol><li>Did assigned read:</li></ol>	ings contribute to	what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assign	nments contribute	to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading sy	ystem clearly expl	ained	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	680/1427	4.33	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was	s class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grad	de the overall tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1434	4.75	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.75
Lecture																
1. Were the instructor	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared				0	0	1	0	3	4.50	798/1387	4.50	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor	r seem interested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture mater:	ial presented and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual to	echniques enhance	your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss:	ions contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students	actively encourag	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor	r encourage fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techn	4. Were special techniques successful					0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00
		Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	ı									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	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	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 178 01
Title Begin Keyboard Skil

Begin Keyboard Skills Beith,Nancy S

Instructor: Beith, Nancy

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 13

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 993 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluati	on Questi	lonnai	ire
---------	--------	----------	-----------	--------	-----

			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	1	0	0	2	٥	4.46	640/1447	4.56	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	4.94	4.78	4.27	4.10	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1241	4.90	4.78	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	Ω	5.00	1/1402		4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	1	0	1		****/1358	****	4.53	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	0	1		****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1427	4.94	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	4.72	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	5	- 6	4.55	315/1434				4.10	4.55
7. Now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	_	1	U	U	U	J	U	4.55	313/1434	1.51	1.01	4.10	4.10	1.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	4.17	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1380	4.33	4.80	4.32	4.31	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
	10	0	^	0	^	_	1	F 00	**** /11 <b>7</b> 0	****	4 70	4 1 5	2 05	****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1172		4.72	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1170		4.78	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	U	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 31	****	4.92	4.72	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	4.49	****
i. has one recasion, eastering by proceeds helpfur		J	3	3	3	0	_	2.00	, 20		3.00	1.00	1.15	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sid	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 178 02 Title

Begin Keyboard Skills

Instructor: Beith, Nancy S

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 9

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 994 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies					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	Ο	Ο	0	3	6	4.67	408/1447	4.56	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	128/1447	4.94	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	231/1241	4.90	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	591/1402	4.71	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1358	****	4.53	4.11	4.03	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	99/1427	4.94	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	1124/1447	4.72	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	754/1434	4.34	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1325/1387	4.17	4.74	4.46	4.46	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	815/1380	4.33	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	0		****/1172		4.72	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/1182		4.83	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.17	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 179 01

Title Interm Keyboard Skills

Instructor: Beith, Nancy S

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 5

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 995 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluati	on Questi	lonnai	ire
---------	--------	----------	-----------	--------	-----

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	Λ	0	0	0	Λ	1	1	4.80	254/1447	4.52	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	- <del>-</del>	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	494/1402	4.65	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.62	4.14	3.99	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	4.85	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.92	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	454/1434	4.30	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.50	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.38	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.49	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.31	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	4	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General 0		Under-grad	Under-grad 5		3
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 179 02

Interm Keyboard Skills Beith, Nancy S Title

Instructor:

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 996 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

				_	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	3	4	6	4.23	889/1447	4.52	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	165/1402	4.65	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	***
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	4.67	4.62	4.14	3.99	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	256/1427	4.85	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	646/1447	4.92	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	701/1434	4.30	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	***
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	***
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.50	****
Freq	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 9		Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor		9	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 or	12

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
			2	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 180 01

Title Beginning Piano Class

Questions

Instructor: Beith, Nancy S

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 14

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 997 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

responses to be significant

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean

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

		Genera	1																
1. Did you	gain ne	w insights,ski	lls from	n this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	585/1	447	4.50	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.50
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	292/1	447	4.71	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.71
	_	estions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	186/1		4.86	4.84	4.33	4.25	4.86
		ations reflect			0	2	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	494/1		4.50	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.50
	_	_		what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	931/1		3.89	4.53	4.11	4.03	3.89
		_		what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	0	0		****/1		****	4.62	4.14	3.99	****
		system clearly		ined	0	0	1	2	2	6	3		1237/1		3.57	4.53	4.19	4.24	3.57
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1		5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How wou	.ld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	983/1	434	3.91	4.64	4.10	4.10	3.91
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	e instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	orepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	414/1	387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.77
2. Did the	instruc	tor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	422/1	387	4.92	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lec	ture mat	erial presente	d and ex	kplained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	431/1	386	4.67	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.67
4. Did the	lecture	s contribute to	o what y	you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1	380	4.92	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.92
5. Did aud	iovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	3	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	256/1	193	4.56	4.68	4.02	3.99	4.56
1 5 1	2.1	Discus				0	-	•	•	0	•	2 00	4.4.4.4.71	1.00	ale ale ale ale	4 50	4 1 5	2 05	****
				what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	0		****/1		***	4.72	4.15	3.95	****
				d to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1		****	4.83	4.35	4.18	****
		_		d open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	0	0		****/1		****	4.78	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were sp	ecial te	chniques succe	ssiul		11	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/	800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	***
		Labora	tory																
1. Did the	lab inc	rease understa	nding of	f the material	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	189	****	****	4.34	4.18	****
				ground information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
				or lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	186	****	****	4.48	4.46	***
		tructor provid			13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	187	****	****	4.33	4.37	***
5. Were re	quiremen	ts for lab rep	orts cle	early specified	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	168	****	****	4.20	4.29	****
		Semina	r																
4. Did pre	sentatio	ns contribute	to what	you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
_		or grading made		•	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
				Frequ	lency	Dist	tribu	utioi	1										
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3				Тур	е			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajor	 s	0	Grad	 uate		0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 0															
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0		Ger	neral	1				3	Unde:	r-gr	ad 1	4	Non-	major	14
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 1																			
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0						Ele	ectiv	ves				5	####	- M	eans t	here a	re not	enoug	h

Other

3

P 2

I 0

0

Course-Section: MUSC 181 01 University of Maryland Title Intermediate Piano Cla

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 998

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

Beith, Nancy S

							Fre	quen	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions			NR	N	ΙA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	~ .																	
1 Did	General		+b:	0		0	0	1	1	1	0	4.50	585/1447	4.50	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.50
<ol> <li>Did you gain new insi</li> <li>Did the instructor ma</li> </ol>				0		0	0	0	1	1 0	9 11	4.83	170/1447	4.83	4.78	4.31	4.18	4.83
3. Did the exam question				0		-	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	451/1241	4.60	4.76	4.33	4.25	4.60
4. Did other evaluations				0			0	1	2	0	9	4.42	603/1402		4.74	4.24	4.15	4.42
5. Did assigned readings				0		8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	345/1358		4.53	4.11	4.03	4.50
6. Did written assignmen			-			•	1	0	2	1	2		1134/1316		4.62	4.14	3.99	3.50
7. Was the grading syste			-	.ea 0			1	2	0	2	6		1077/1427		4.53	4.19	4.24	3.91
8. How many times was cl			eu	0			0	0	0	1	11	4.92	436/1447		4.63	4.69	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade t			na effectivene	-		0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	540/1434			4.10	4.10	
J. How would you grade t	iic overar	i ccaciii	ing criccervenc	55 0		0	O	Ü	-	-	O	1.55	310/1131	1.33	1.01	1.10	1.10	1.55
	Lecture																	
1. Were the instructor's	lectures	well pr	epared	5		0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1015/1387	4.29	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.29
2. Did the instructor se		_	-	5		0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	656/1387	4.86	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material				5		0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	855/1386		4.77	4.32	4.32	4.29
4. Did the lectures cont				5		0	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	1128/1380	3.86	4.80	4.32	4.31	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techn	iques enh	ance you	r understandin	g 5		2	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	999/1193	3.40	4.68	4.02	3.99	3.40
	-	-		_														
	Discuss	ion																
1. Did class discussions	contribu	te to wh	at you learned	10		0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students act	ively end	ouraged	to participate	10		0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor en	courage f	air and	open discussio	n 10		0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniqu	es succes	sful		10		0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****
			Fr	equenc	y D	istr	ribu	tion										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grad	00				Pos	sons				Тур	20			Majors	
00-27 0 0.0	0-0.99	0	A 8			Requ	iire	d fo	r Ma	jor	S	0	Graduate	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 2 1.0	0-1.99	0	в 1															
56-83 1 2.0	0-2.99	1	C 0			Gene	eral					0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	12
84-150 2 3.0	0-3.49	1	D 0															
Grad. 0 3.5	0-4.00	4	F 0			Elec	tiv	es				9	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
			P 1										response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
			I 0			Othe	er					1						
			? 0															

Course-Section: MUSC 184 01 University of Maryland Title Beginning Woodwind Cla Baltimore County

Spring 2010 Instructor: Belzer, Matthew

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

1

F

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

	Evaluation	

Page 999

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll tead	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	540/1434	4.33	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.33
		Lectur	9															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute to	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
				Frequ	lency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	ре			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 0	A 3		Red	auir	ed fo	or Ma	iors		3	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1		2.0	-1 ~ -1 .		10	- ,	-	-	or adda	-	-			_
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad	4	Non-	-major	1
84-150												5				3		
	-	2.23 3.13	_	= 0														

Electives

Other

0

0

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Section: MUSC 185 01 University of Maryland Page 1000 Title Interm Woodwind Class Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Belzer, Matthew

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

Spring 2010
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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	3	5	4.63	452/1447	4.63	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	137/1447	4.88	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	217/1402	4.75	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	430/1358	4.43	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	3.99	***
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	373/1427	4.57	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.57
How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	190/1434	4.71	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6 6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	3.99	****

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

University of Maryland Page 1001
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: MUSC 189 01

Guitar Class

13

Dunlap, Matthew

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

		Questions			NR	NA	Fre 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
General																			
	1 Did 1701	ı gəin ne		_	this source	1	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	2	_	1 62	152/1117	1 62	1 75	1 21	1 10	4.63
						_	•	•	0	•	-	_		- ,					4.88
							•	-			_	-		- ,					5.00
The state of the s							-				-	_		,					5.00
							_	-	-	-	-								4.67
		_	-		-	1	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	166/1316	4.75	4.62		3.99	4.75
						1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.75
						1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 190/1434 4.71 4.64 4.10 4.10 4.7					ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	190/1434	4.71	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.71
					-														
Lecture			Lecture	е															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1387 **** 4.74 4.46 4.46 ***	1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well p	repared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	****	4.74	4.46	4.46	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1387 **** 4.92 4.73 4.71 ***	2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested in	the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	****	4.92	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was recture material presented and explained creatry 7 0 0 0 0 2 3.00 71300 4.77 4.32 4.32						7	0	-	-	-	0	2				4.77			****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 2 3.00 /1300 4.00 4.32 4.31		4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					-	-	-	-	•	2		,		4.80		4.31	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding $7$ 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00 ****/1193 **** 4.68 4.02 3.99 ***	5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion																			
1. Did class discussions conclidute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 /11/2 4.13 3.93					-		-	-	-	-	0	1		,					****
z. Well all beadenes actively checalaged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 /1102 1.03 1.33 1.10							-				-	1		, -					****
3. Did the instructor encodings rail and open discussion of the tenth of the first rail of the first r					open discussion						-	_		,					****
4. Were special techniques successful 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 4.85 4.06 3.95 ***	4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	3.95	****
					_			,											
Frequency Distribution					Freq	uency	Dis	tribi	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	\$
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 Required for Majors 6 Graduate 0 Major 7	00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А б		Re	auire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	6	Graduat	 е	0	Maio	r .r	7
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1							Required for i												
						General						0	Under-q	rad	9	Non-	major	2	
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0																3			
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough	Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives						0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoue	jh	
P 0 responses to be significant					P 0													_	
I 0 Other 0					I 0		Other						0	-					
? 0					? 0	Ochei													

Course-Section: MUSC 190 01 Title

Perf.Studies:Western A

Instructor: Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 3

Franklin, Rachel

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1002 JUN 28, 2010 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	3	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	4.92	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182		4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170		4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190 02

Title Perf.Studies:Western A

Instructor: Hawley JR, Thoma

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 9

84-150

Grad.

2

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 3

2

D 0

0

0

0

F

I 0

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1003 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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	Ο	9	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	128/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	380/1241		4.84	4.33	4.25	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402		4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1358		4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	0	2		****/1316		4.62	4.14	3.99	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	842/1427		4.53	4.19	4.24	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7		803/1447		4.63	4.69	4.68	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	141/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1172		4.72	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/1182		4.83	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/1170		4.78	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	Λ	7	5.00	1/ 31	4.67	4.92	4.72	4.50	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 31		5.00	4.57	4.38	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	1	0	0	0	0	5 6	5.00	1/ 31		5.00	4.64	4.36	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	5	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 20		5.00	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 15		5.00	4.61	4.31	****
3. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	J	U	U	U	U	2	3.00	/ 13	3.00	3.00	1.01	1.51	
Freq	uency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re:	asons	3			Ty	ne			Majors	
						- 								
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	S	2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0	-									,				
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0	General							0	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	major	9

Electives

Other

4

1

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Course-Secti	on: MUSC 190 04	University of Maryland	Page 10
Title	Perf.Studies:Western A	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 20
	and the second s	- 1	

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

6

L004 2010 Instructor: Caracciolo,Step Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	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	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 05 University of Maryland Page 1005 Perf.Studies:Western A JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Baltimore County Spring 2010 Title Instructor: Jackson, Janice

Enrollment:	7	
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
G1														
General		_	_	_	_	_	_							
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.92	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1202/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Frequ	ıency	Dist	rib	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	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	3	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-	•		
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 06 University of Maryland Title Perf.Studies:Western A Baltimore County

Instructor: King, Thomas D. Enrollment: 8

Ouestionnaires: 2

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1006 JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

abberomarrop														
	Frequencies								ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	341/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00

# Frequency Distribution

3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1170 5.00 4.78 4.38 4.17 5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190 08 University of Maryland Title Perf.Studies:Western A

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1007

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
***************************************														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1291/1358	4.06	4.53	4.11	4.03	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	5.00 5.00 5.00	1/1387 1/1387 1/1386	4.77 4.90 4.88	4.74 4.92 4.77	4.46 4.73 4.32	4.46 4.71 4.32	5.00 5.00 5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380		4.80	4.32		5.00
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  4. Were special techniques successful	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 2 2 1	5.00	1/1172 1/1182 1/1170 1/ 800	5.00 5.00 5.00	4.72 4.83 4.78 4.85	4.15 4.35 4.38 4.06	3.95 4.18 4.17 3.95	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00

Credits Ea	edits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	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	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 09

Perf.Studies:Western A

Title Instructor: Tremblay,Christ

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1008 JUN 28, 2010 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	3	4.75	309/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 31	4.67	4.92	4.72	4.50	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.49	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 190 11 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County Spring 2010 Perf.Studies:Western A Instructor: Ladd,Gita

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 7

Page 1009 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

			Fr	eque	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	507/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	292/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	4.92	4.84	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1358	4.06	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	154/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1139/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	s 2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	566/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	253/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	273/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182		4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	4.67	4.92	4.72	4.50	***
Fred	quency	/ Dis	strib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	,			D.C.	asons	a .			Ty	00			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	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	7	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 13 University Title Perf.Studies:Western A Baltimor

Instructor: Dunlap, Matthew

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 1

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1010 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1058/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1053/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	799/1358	4.06	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	812/1316	3.83	4.62	4.14	3.99	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	4.67	4.92	4.72	4.50	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.38	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.31	5.00

Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GP.			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0	220021102		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 15 University of Maryland Page 1011 Title Perf.Studies:Western A Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Kesner,Lori A.

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 5 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	quencies Instructor			ructor			t UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	254/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals		4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1358	4.06	4.53	4.11	4.03	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	754/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	117/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	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	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sic	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-	_	,	
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 28 University of Maryland Title Perf.Studies:Western A Baltimore County Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Dove,Barry B

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1012

JUN 28, 2010

			Fr	eque	ncie	5		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	4.92	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	529/1358	4.06	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1252/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	341/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	Ο	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182		4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	2	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	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 190 37 University of Maryland Page 1013
Title Perf.Studies:Western A Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Richards, Kazuko

Enrollment: 3
Questionnaires: 3

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies			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		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.84	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.86	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals			0	0	0	2	1	4.33	685/1402	4.92	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1291/1358	4.06	4.53	4.11	4.03	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned			0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1050/1316	3.83	4.62	4.14	3.99	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained		2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	971/1427	4.75	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.52	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.87	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1350/1387	4.77	4.74	4.46	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject		0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1320/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1386	4.88	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1030/1380	4.88	4.80	4.32	4.31	4.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193 01 Title Perf Studies

Perf Studies Musc Majo Balt

Instructor: Franklin, Rachel

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1014 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies		Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect					
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	836/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170		4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193 04 University of Maryland Title Perf Studies Musc Majo Baltimore County Spring 2010

Caracciolo,Step

Instructor: Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 1

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1015

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	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	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sic	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_	,	
				2	0						

Course-Section	: MUSC 193 06	University of Maryland	Page 1016
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	King, Thomas D.	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Instructor: King,Thomas D.
Enrollment: 3 Spring 2010

FIII OI I III EII C.	3			
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course	e Evaluation Questionnair	re

			Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course			0	0	0	1	2	4.67	408/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00

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

Course-Section	: MUSC 193 07	University of Maryland	Page 1017
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Markovic-Prakas
Enrollment: 4 Job IRBR3029 Spring 2010

FIII OTTHERIC:	4			
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled									971/1427 1361/1447					

Credits E	arned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	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	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	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	0					
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 193 08 University of Maryland Title Perf Studies Musc Majo

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 2

Instructor: Yoshioka,Airi 3 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland	Page 1018
Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

			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 from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness			0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
-	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/11/2	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.18	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion			0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/11/0	5.00	4.76	4.36	3.95	5.00
1. Were special techniques successful	U	_	U	J	U	U		5.00	1/ 800	5.00	T.05	4.00	3.95	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons		Туре		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	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	nificant		
				I	0	Other	0					
				?	0							

Course-Section: MUSC 193 11 University of Maryland Title Perf Studies Musc Majo Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Ladd,Gita

Enrollment: 2

Questionnaires: 2

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1019

Job IRBR3029

	NID					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	2	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	532/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	341/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	1	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	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	l
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 193 12 University of Maryland Title

0

0

0

0

0

D

F

Ρ

I

Perf Studies Musc Majo Baltimore County Instructor: Lagana, Thomas V Spring 2010

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

56-83

Grad.

84-150

0

0

0

2.00-2.99

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

1

			E-x-	201101	ncies	,		Tnat	tructor	Course	Dont	UMBC	Torrol	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	•	•	_	_	0	F 00	1 /1 4 4 17	4 01	4 85	4 21	4 10	F 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447			4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		,		4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	-	-	0	0	2		1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0		1361/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1172				3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182		4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Туј	pe 			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	3	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	2
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0	Required for Majors 1									,				

General

Other

Electives

0

0

0

Under-grad

2

responses to be significant

#### - Means there are not enough

Non-major

Page 1020

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: MUSC 193 13 University of Maryland Title Perf Studies Musc Majo Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Dunlap,Matthew

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 4

# Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1021

Job IRBR3029

Questions			Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1252/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject			0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly			0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	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	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section	n: MUSC 193 14	University of Maryland	Page 1022
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Cella,Lisa M	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 4 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	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	532/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	976/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Frem	ency	Dist	ribi	ıtior	1									

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

Course-Section	: MUSC 193 15	University of Maryland	Page 1023
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Kesner,Lori A.	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Kesner, Lori A. Spring 2010

Enrollment:	1	-	_
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Eva	luation Questionnaire

					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	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructo	or make clear the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluat	tions reflect the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading s	system clearly expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you gra	ade the overall teach	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced sy	stem contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.50	5.00
3. Were your contact	s with the instruct	or helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00
		Frequ	ıency	Dis	tribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section:	: MUSC 193 17	University of Maryland	Page 1024
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Richards, Edwin	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

COULDE DECETOII.	MOSC 195 17	diversity of Maryland
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County
Instructor:	Richards, Edwin	Spring 2010

Questionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Enrollment: 1

					Frequencies				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	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00	
Frequency Distribution															

Credits Ea	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Rea				Reasons			Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	1	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section	: MUSC 193 18	University of Maryland	Page 1025
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Spece, Richard D	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Instructor:

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 1

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
Deddelle	COULDC	DValuation	Queberonnarie

			Fre	Frequencies				Inst	Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level	
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1058/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1400/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1359/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	799/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1359/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.00

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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
84-150	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	_			
				2	Ω						

Course-Section: MUSC 193 27

Perf Studies Musc Majo

Instructor: Goldstein, Thoma

Enrollment: 3
Questionnaires: 3

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1026 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	459/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	4.89	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.50	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.38	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.49	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.31	5.00
The state of the s	2	Ü	,	,	,	,	_		_,	2.00	2.00	01	01	2.00

Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	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					
				?	0						

Course-Section	n: MUSC 193 30	University of Maryland	Page 1027
Title	Perf Studies Musc Majo	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Pollauf,Jacquel	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Pollauf, Jacquel
Enrollment: 1 Spring 2010

Furoriment.	Ţ			
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 193 33 Title

Perf Studies Musc Majo

Instructor: Ruas,Laura Mari

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 1

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1028 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	4.88	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.73	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.47	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.88	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
T a shows														
Lecture	0	0	0	^	0	^	1	F 00	1 /1 207	г оо	4 7 4	1 10	1 10	F 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387		4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386		4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182		4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170		4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 800		4.85	4.06	3.95	5.00
1. Here openial confiniques successful	0	0	5	3	3	3	_	3.00	1, 000	3.00	1.05	1.00	3.75	3.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	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	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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other		-			
				2	Ω						

Course-Section	: MUSC 194 02	University of Maryland	Page 1029
Title	Perf Studies: Musc Maj	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Hawley JR, Thoma	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Hawley JR, Thoma Instructor: Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Fre	equei	ncies	3		Insti	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.58	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.58	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.83	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.50	5.00
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.49	5.00
uency	Dis	trib	ution	ı									
	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1	NR NA 1 2	NR NA 1 2 3	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1434  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 31 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 32	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean  0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 4.58 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 4.58 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 4.58 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1434 4.83	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 5.00 4.75 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 5.00 4.78 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1427 4.58 4.53 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 4.58 4.63 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1434 4.83 4.64  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1434 4.83 4.64	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 5.00 4.75 4.31 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 5.00 4.78 4.27 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 4.58 4.53 4.19 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 4.58 4.63 4.69 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1434 4.83 4.64 4.10  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 31 5.00 4.92 4.72 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 31 5.00 5.00 4.64 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 20 5.00 5.00 4.60	NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 5.00 4.75 4.31 4.18 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 5.00 4.78 4.27 4.30 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1427 4.58 4.53 4.19 4.24 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1447 4.58 4.63 4.69 4.68 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1434 4.83 4.64 4.10 4.10  0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 31 5.00 4.92 4.72 4.50 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 31 5.00 5.00 4.64 4.65 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 20 5.00 5.00 4.60 4.49

Credits Ea	edits Earned Cum. GPA		A Expected Grades			Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	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	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Ω						

Course-Section	: MUSC 194 04	University of Maryland	Page 1030
Title	Perf Studies: Musc Maj	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Caracciolo,Step	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	2	_				
Ouestionnaires:	1		Student.	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.58	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.58	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.83	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	Reasons			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
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	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	ι
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 194 06 University of Maryland Page 1031 Title Perf Studies: Musc Maj Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: King, Thomas D.

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 2

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fre	quer	cies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.58	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.58	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.83	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	4.50	4.74	4.46	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	4.50	4.72	4.15	3.95	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182		4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	1	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	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section	: MUSC 194 12	University of Maryland	Page 1032
Title	Perf Studies: Musc Maj	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Lagana, Thomas V	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 2

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.99	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	459/1427	4.58	4.53	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1447	4.58	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	4.83	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 194 13 University of Maryland Title Perf Studies: Musc Maj

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1033

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

Dunlap,Matthew

	Ouestions		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	; 	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new i	nsights,skills fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor	make clear the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluati	ons reflect the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	976/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading sy	stem clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1359/1427	4.58	4.53	4.19	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was	class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.58	4.63	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grad	le the overall tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1434	4.83	4.64	4.10	4.10	4.00
1	Lecture	,	•	0	0	•	•	-	_	4 00	1186/1208	4 50	4 54	1 16	1 16	4 00
1. Were the instructo			0	0	0	0	0	Ţ	0		1176/1387		4.74	4.46	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1387		4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture materi			0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1386		4.77	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures of	contribute to what	you learned	0	0	U	U	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.31	5.00
	Discussion															
1. Did class discussi	ons contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	710/1172	4.50	4.72	4.15	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1182		4.83	4.35	4.18	5.00
3. Did the instructor			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170		4.78	4.38	4.17	5.00
	Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced sys		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92		4.50	5.00
<ol><li>Did study question</li></ol>			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.38	5.00
<ol><li>Were your contacts</li></ol>		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31		5.00	4.64	4.65	5.00
4. Was the feedback/t	cutoring by procto	rs helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.49	5.00
		Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	1									
		_	-													
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ty	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section	n: MUSC 194 28	University of Maryland	Page 1034
Title	Perf Studies: Musc Maj	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Dove, Barry B	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1				
Ouestionnaires:	1	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	4.58	4.53	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.58	4.63	4.69	4.68	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.83	4.64	4.10	4.10	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 211 01 Musicianship Lab IV Pollauf, Jacquel

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 16

22

University of Maryland Page 1035 Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	452/1447	4.63	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.63
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	249/1447	4.75	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.75
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	168/1241	4.88	4.84	4.33	4.35	4.88
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	136/1402	4.85	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.85
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.53	4.11	4.12	4.67
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.62	4.14	4.08	4.67
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	y expla:	ined	0	2	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	301/1427	4.64	4.53	4.19	4.14	4.64
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1343/1447	4.06	4.63	4.69	4.70	4.06
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	478/1434	4.38	4.64	4.10	3.97	4.38
		Lecture	٩															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	_	prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.42	5.00
		ctor seem inter		_	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	784/1387	4.80	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.80
	Was lecture material presented and explained clear						0	0	0	1	3	4.75	316/1386	4.75	4.77	4.32	4.24	4.75
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	3	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.80	4.32	4.30	4.75
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	12	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.04	****
1 5 1 1		Discus			1.0	0	•	•	_	•		F 00	1 /11 0	F 00	4 50	4 1 5	4 10	F 00
				what you learned	12 12	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1172 1/1182		4.72 4.83	4.15	4.12	5.00 5.00
				d to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	4		****/1170	5.00 ****	4.83	4.35	4.30	5.UU ****
		echniques succe		d open discussion	13	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 800		4.78	4.38		****
4. were s	врестат с	echniques succe	SSLUI		13	Т	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	***/ 800		4.85	4.06	4.01	
				Freq	uency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	5
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajor	s 1	.1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0		~		,				0	1	, ,	_			0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge:	nera	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	6	Non-	-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								0			1			.1-
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 8 F 0						ΕŢ	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	lu
				P 0		٥-	her					0	respons	a oj as	e sign	ıııcar	11	
				? 1		Ut.	ner.					U						
				; I														

Course-Section: MUSC 214 01

Hist Jazz: Origins-Pre

Goldstein, Thoma Instructor:

Enrollment: 86 Questionnaires: 49

Title

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1036 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Co	ourse 1	Evaluation	Questionnaire
------------	---------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncie	c c		Tnat	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	T.evel	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NΔ	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
׫«» «»»														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	8	0	0	0	5	17	19	4.34	781/1447	4.34	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	2	4	10	24	4.40	677/1447	4.40	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	5	9	27	4.54	514/1241	4.54	4.84	4.33	4.35	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	27	1	0	3	2	8	4.14	873/1402	4.14	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	4	6	11	18	3.95	858/1358	3.95	4.53	4.11	4.12	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	36	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	1	3	5	32	4.66	292/1427	4.66	4.53	4.19	4.14	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	1	0	2	38	4.88	565/1447	4.88	4.63	4.69	4.70	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	1	1	6	20	6	3.85	1017/1434	3.85	4.64	4.10	3.97	3.85
Lecture														
<ol> <li>Were the instructor's lectures well prepared</li> </ol>	10	0	0	0	6	10	23	4.44	870/1387	4.44	4.74	4.46	4.42	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	2	35	4.85	681/1387	4.85	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	6	8	24	4.41	733/1386	4.41	4.77	4.32	4.24	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	4	4	30	4.59	571/1380	4.59	4.80	4.32	4.30	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	1	2	2	8	23	4.39	388/1193	4.39	4.68	4.02	4.04	4.39
Discussion	20	0	2	1	2	0	8	3.85	025/1170	2 05	4 70	<i>1</i> 1 F	4.12	3.85
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36 25	0	1	1 2	2	3	8 6		835/1172	3.85	4.72	4.15		3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35 36	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	1002/1182 672/1170	3.79 4.38	4.83 4.78	4.35 4.38	4.30	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	36	6	0	0	0	1	-		****/ 800	4.38	4.78	4.38	4.32	4.38
4. Were special techniques successiul	30	О	U	U	U	Т	О	4.80	***/ 800	***	4.85	4.06	4.01	
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	47	0	0	0	0	0	2.	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	47	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	47	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	47	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	***
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.36	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.70	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.49	3.25	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.43 ****	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.32	****	****
	47	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 27	****	****	4.30	****	****
Did conferences help you carry out field activities		U	U	U	U	U	۷	5.00	2/			4.43		
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.92	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: MUSC 214 01

Title Hist Jazz: Origins-Pre

Instructor: Goldstein, Thoma

Enrollment: 86
Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1036 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	 6	0.00-0.99	1	 А	21	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	2	В	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	20	Under-grad	Non-major	44	
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-		_	
				?	2						

Course-Section: MUSC 217 01

Title Rock & Related Music

Instructor: Morin, Joseph C

Enrollment: 191
Questionnaires: 89

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1037 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		ND NA		Fre	quer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	9	0	0	0	1	10	69	4.85	201/1447	4.85	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.85
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	0	3	12	65	4.78	228/1447	4.78	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.78
3 .	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	1	2	8	70	4.81	222/1241	4.81	4.84	4.33	4.35	4.81
4 .	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	54	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	228/1402	4.74	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.74
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	50	4	0	8	1	17	3.90	917/1358	3.90	4.53	4.11	4.12	3.90
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	67	0	1	2	0	12	4.53	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.08	****
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	1	1	7	73	4.85	120/1427	4.85	4.53	4.19	4.14	4.85
8.	How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	1	2	44	35	4.38	1175/1447	4.38	4.63	4.69	4.70	4.38
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	1	0	0	5	33	29	4.36	516/1434	4.36	4.64	4.10	3.97	4.36
	Lecture					_				460/4000	4 00				4 00
	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	4		4.92	160/1387	4.92	4.74	4.46	4.42	4.92
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	4	72	4.92	422/1387	4.92	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.92
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	4		4.92		4.92	4.77	4.32	4.24	4.92
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	0	3	73	4.92	127/1380	4.92	4.80	4.32	4.30	4.92
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	0	1	0	3	71	4.92	52/1193	4.92	4.68	4.02	4.04	4.92
	Discussion														
1	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	60	0	5	1	2	3	18	3.97	746/1172	3.97	4.72	4.15	4.12	3.97
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	62	0	8	4	4	0	11		1136/1182	3.07	4.83	4.35	4.30	3.07
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	62	0	6	4	2	2	13		1088/1170	3.44	4.78	4.38	4.32	3.44
	Were special techniques successful	59	21	0	0	2	2	5		****/ 800	****	4.85		4.01	****
-	Were Special commission passessial	0,0		Ü	ŭ	_	_		1.55	, 555		1.00	1.00	1.01	
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	87	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.47	****
2.	Were you provided with adequate background information	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	88	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.46	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
_	Seminar		•			_	_						4 =0		
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.30	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.43	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	87	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.28	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.30	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.79	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 65	***	****	4.42	4.36	****
5.	Were criteria for grading made clear	87	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.70	***
	Field Work														
1	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	2.25	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.25	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	87	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.30	****	****
	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	87	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 27	****	****	4.43	****	****
		-	-	-	-		-	-		,					
	Self Paced														
	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.92	4.72	****	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	87	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	87	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	***
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	87	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	****	***
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	87	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	****	****

Course-Section: MUSC 217 01

Title Rock & Related Music

Instructor: Morin, Joseph C

Enrollment: 191
Questionnaires: 89

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1037 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons			Majors		
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	2	 А	37	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	21						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	29	Under-grad	89	Non-major	88
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	20	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other		-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 1038

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Enrollment:	4	
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: MUSC 222 1

Jazz Arranging

Belzer, Matthew

Title

Instructor:

Questions				MD	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
												Mean		Mean			Mean	
		Genera	1															
1. Did vou	u gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.31	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27		5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.35	5.00
4. Did oth	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.12	5.00
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.08	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.14	5.00
8. How mar	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.63	4.69	4.70	4.67
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	3.97	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1 Were th	he instri	uctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5 00	4 74	4 46	4.42	5.00
		ctor seem inter			1		0	0	0	0	2			5.00			4.71	5.00
		xplained clearly	1		0					5.00			4.77					
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							0	0	0		5.00	1/1380				4.30	
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi						0	0	1	0	1	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.68	4.02	4.04	4.00
		Discus							•		_		4 /4 4 5 0		4 = 0			- 00
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1172		4.72			5.00
				d to participate		0		0	0			5.00	1/1182		4.83		4.30	5.00
				d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0		1		1/1170		4.78	4.38	4.32	
4. were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssiui		2	U	U	U	U	0	Τ	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	4.01	5.00
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	a was a d	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Do	ason	~			Тур				Majors	
										> 								, 
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	S	2	Graduate	9	0	Majo	r	3
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0																	
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Gei	nera:	L				0	Under-gi	rad	3	Non-	major	0
84-150																		_
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					Electives 0 #### - Means there are							ŗh						
P 0						0.1						0	response	es to b	e sign	ıfican	ıt	
I 0						Otl	her					0						
	? 0																	

Baltimore County Spring 2010

University of Maryland

Page 1039

JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	11				
Questionnaires:	11	Student Course	Eva	luation	Questionnaire

Course-Section: MUSC 224 1

Instrumentation

Dusman,Linda J

Title

Instructor:

								-	ncies	5	-		tructor	Course	-	UMBC		Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain n	ew insights,ski	- lls from	this course	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	452/1447	4.63	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.63
		ctor make clear			3	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	974/1447	4.13	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.13
		uestions reflec			3	2	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	844/1241	4.17	4.84	4.33	4.35	4.17
4. Did otl	her eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	358/1402	4.63	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.63
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	173/1358	4.75	4.53	4.11	4.12	4.75
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	3	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	***	4.62	4.14	4.08	****
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y explai	ned	3	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.53	4.19	4.14	4.00
	-	was class canc			3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447		4.63	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	600/1434	4.29	4.64	4.10	3.97	4.29
		Lectur	_															
		uctor's lecture	-	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1387		4.74		4.42	****	
		ctor seem inter	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1387	****	4.92	4.73	4.71	****	
		-		plained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1386		4.77	4.32	4.24	****
		es contribute t			9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1380		4.80	4.32	4.30	****
5. Did au	diovisua	I techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.04	****
		Discus																
1 Did al-	ann dina			what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	Λ	1	E 00	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	4.12	****
				to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1182		4.83	4.35	4.30	****
		_	_	d open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1170			4.38	4.32	****
J. DIG CIR	e macru	ctor encourage	Iair and	open discussion	10	O	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	/11/0		1.70	1.50	1.52	
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	ı
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	guir	ed fo	or Ma	jors		6	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	r	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3		1101	1			.,		-	2_ 34440	-	-	- 100 ) 0	_	•
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									J				<b>J</b>	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons				_	
				I 0		Oth	ner					0	-					
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 226 01 Title

Theory IV: Music Writin

Instructor: Macaulay, Janice

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 12

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1040 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# 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	11	4.92	133/1447	4.92	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4		4.67	352/1447		4.78	4.27	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1057/1358	3.70	4.53	4.11	4.12	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	582/1427	4.42	4.53	4.19	4.14	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1202/1447	4.33	4.63	4.69	4.70	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	442/1434	4.42	4.64	4.10	3.97	4.42
T a mboose														
Lecture	-	0	•	•	0	_	_	F 00	1 /1205	F 00	4 54	4 46	4 40	F 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387		4.74		4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	2	3 5	4.60 5.00	510/1386 1/1380	4.60	4.77	4.32	4.24	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	0	0	0	5 4		1/1193	5.00	4.80			5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	/	1	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1182		4.83	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.32	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enougl	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-	_		
				2	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 230 01 University of Maryland
Title Musics Of The World Baltimore County
Instructor: Beck, Gina C Spring 2010

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 25

40

University of Maryland Page 1041
Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010
Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 543		General	_		1	0	1	0	1	0	1 2	4 20	750/1447	4 20	4 75	4 21	4 21	4 20
		ew insights,skil ctor make clear			1	0	1	1	1 2	9 7	13 13	4.38	752/1447 853/1447	4.38 4.25	4.75 4.78	4.31 4.27	4.31	4.38 4.25
		lestions reflect			1	0	0	2	1	2	19	4.25	469/1241	4.25	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.25
		ations reflect			7	8	1	1	T	1	10	4.20	827/1402		4.74	4.33	4.24	4.20
				hat you learned	3	2	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	563/1358		4.53	4.11	4.12	4.30
	_	-		what you learned	2	14	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	342/1316		4.62	4.14	4.08	4.56
		signments contri system clearly		2	2	7.4	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	256/1427		4.53	4.19	4.14	4.70
		was class cance		illed	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	243/1447	4.96	4.63	4.69	4.70	4.96
				ning effectiveness		0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	849/1434		4.64	4.10	3.97	
J. 110W WO	ara you s	jidae ene overa.	LI CCGCI	ing criceciveness		Ü	Ü	-	-	3	Ü	1.00	015/1151	1.00	1.01	1.10	3.77	1.00
		Lecture	2															
1. Were tl	he instru	actor's lectures	s well r	repared	5	0	0	1	0	3	16	4.70	521/1387	4.70	4.74	4.46	4.42	4.70
		ctor seem intere	_	-	4	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	528/1387	4.90	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.90
					5	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	392/1386		4.77	4.32	4.24	4.70
		ture material presented and explained clear lectures contribute to what you learned iovisual techniques enhance your understand					1	0	0	3	17	4.67	463/1380	4.67	4.80	4.32	4.30	4.67
5. Did au	diovisual	our understanding	5	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	82/1193	4.85	4.68	4.02	4.04	4.85		
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contribu	ite to v	hat you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	couraged	l to participate	19	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.30	****
		_		l open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	5		****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.32	***
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		19	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	4.01	****
				Freq	uency	7 Dist	tribu	utior	1									
Credits E	arnod	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pos	sons				Туј	20			Majors	
crearts E	arneu 	Cuill. GPA		Expected Grades					180118	· - – – –							Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	s	7	Graduate	e	1	Majo	r	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	в 9			-			,								
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Gei	nera:	L			1	.0	Under-g	rad 2	4	Non-	major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0									3				-	
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 1									response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	her					0	_		_			
				? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 301 01 University of Maryland
Title Chambers Players Baltimore County

Instructor: Yoshioka, Airi (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 15 Ouestionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Spring 2010

Page 1042

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 3 9 4.75 309/1447 4.75 4.75 4.31 4.32 4.75 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 1 4.83 170/1447 4.83 4.78 4.27 4.23 4.83 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1241 5.00 4.84 4.33 4.33 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 380/1402 4.60 4.74 4.24 4.24 4.60 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 9 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1358 5.00 4.53 4.11 4.10 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1316 \*\*\*\* 4.62 4.14 4.13 \*\*\*\* 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 6 0 0 1 0 5 4.67 283/1427 4.67 4.53 4.19 4.15 4.67 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 5 5 4.50 1079/1447 4.50 4.63 4.69 4.65 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 10 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1434 4.60 4.64 4.10 4.09 4.60 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1387 \*\*\*\* 4.74 4.46 4.44 \*\*\*\* 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 10 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1387 \*\*\*\* 4.92 4.73 4.71 \*\*\*\* 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1386 \*\*\*\* 4.77 4.32 4.30 \*\*\*\* 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1380 \*\*\*\* 4.80 4.32 4.32 \*\*\*\* 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 10 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 \*\*\*\*/1193 \*\*\*\* 4.68 4.02 4.05 \*\*\*\* Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1172 5.00 4.72 4.15 4.24 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1182 5.00 4.83 4.35 4.42 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1170 5.00 4.78 4.38 4.49 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/800 5.00 4.85 4.06 4.12 5.00 Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades Credits Earned Reasons Majors 

 00-27
 2
 0.00-0.99
 0
 A
 10

 28-55
 2
 1.00-1.99
 0
 B
 0

 56-83
 1
 2.00-2.99
 0
 C
 0

 84-150
 3
 3.00-3.49
 1
 D
 0

 Grad.
 0
 3.50-4.00
 6
 F
 0

 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 5 General 0 Under-grad 12 Non-major 7 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough

Other

1

P 0

Ι 0

Course-Section: MUSC 301 01 University of Maryland Page 1043 Chambers Players Title Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Ladd,Gita (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 12

Spring 2010

Ceneral   Company			Questions			NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean			Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 8. How mould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 9. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Did the instructor																			
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 11 4.83 170/1447 4.83 4.78 4.27 4.23 4.83 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 0 0 0 1 4 0.00 1/1241 5.00 4.84 4.33 4.33 4.35 0.04 Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 380/1402 4.60 4.74 4.24 4.24 4.60 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 5 0.00 1/1358 5.00 4.53 4.11 4.10 5.00 6.00 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 6 0 0 1 0 5 5 4.67 283/1427 4.67 4.53 4.19 4.15 4.67 8.16 Mm many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 5 5 4.67 283/1427 4.67 4.53 4.19 4.15 4.67 8.16 Mm many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 5 5 4.67 283/1427 4.67 4.53 4.19 4.15 4.67 8.16 Mm many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 1 0 5 5 4.67 283/1427 4.67 4.53 4.19 4.10 4.09 4.60 9.10 Mm would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 701/1434 4.60 4.64 4.10 4.09 4.60 4.64 4.10 4.09 4.60 4.60 4.60 4.60 4.60 4.60 4.60 4.60							•	•			_			000/444	4 ==				4 ==
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 8 0 0 0 0 4 5.00 1/1241 5.00 4.84 4.33 4.33 5.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 380/1402 4.6 0 4.74 4.24 4.24 4.24 4.60 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1358 5.00 4.53 4.11 4.10 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1316 **** 4.62 4.14 4.13 **** 4.72 4.24 4.24 6.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 6 0 0 1 0 5 4.67 283/1427 4.67 4.53 4.19 4.15 4.67 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 5 5 5 4.67 283/1427 4.67 4.53 4.19 4.15 4.67 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 5 5 5 4.50 1079/1447 4.50 4.63 4.69 4.65 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 20 701/1434 4.60 4.64 4.10 4.09 4.60 4.65 4.50 4.65 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1387 **** 4.74 4.46 4.44 **	_	_	J ,			_	-	0	U	-	_	- 9		,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. 0. 0. 0. 0. 5 5 4.67 283/1427 4.67 4.53 4.19 4.15 4.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 5 5 4.67 283/1427 4.67 4.53 4.19 4.15 4.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 5 5 4.50 1079/1447 4.60 4.63 4.09 4.05 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0.						_		-	-		-			- ,					
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 9 9 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1358 5.00 4.53 4.11 4.10 5.00 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1316 **** 4.62 4.14 4.13 **** 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 6 0 0 1 0 5 5 4.67 283/1427 4.67 4.53 4.19 4.15 4.67 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 5 5 5 4.50 1079/1447 4.50 4.63 4.69 4.65 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 701/1434 4.60 4.64 4.10 4.09 4.65 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 701/1434 4.60 4.64 4.10 4.09 4.65 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 701/1434 4.60 4.64 4.10 4.09 4.65 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 701/1434 4.60 4.64 4.10 4.09 4.65 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		_			_		8	-	-	-		4							
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 9 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/1316 **** 4.62 4.14 4.13 ****  7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 6 0 0 1 0 5 5 4.67 283/1427 4.67 4.53 4.19 4.15 4.67 8.88 How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 5 5 5 4.50 1079/1447 4.50 4.63 4.69 4.65 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 701/1434 4.60 4.64 4.10 4.09 4.60    **Lecture**  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1387 **** 4.74 4.46 4.44 ****  2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0							/					3		,					
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 6 0 0 1 0 5 4.67 283/1427 4.67 4.53 4.19 4.15 4.67 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 5 5 4.50 1079/1447 4.50 4.63 4.69 4.65 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 701/1434 4.60 4.64 4.10 4.09 4.60 4.61 4.10 4.09 4.60 4.10 4.09 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10							-	-	-	-	-	3		,					
8. How many times was class cancelled 1 1 0 0 0 5 5 5 4.50 1079/1447 4.50 4.63 4.69 4.65 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.20 701/1434 4.60 4.64 4.10 4.09 4.60    Lecture  Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1387 **** 4.74 4.46 4.44 ***** 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 11 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1387 **** 4.92 4.73 4.71 **** 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1386 **** 4.77 4.32 4.30 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			_		2		-	-	-	-	-			,					
Lecture   Lect		_		_	inea		-	-	•	_	-	5		,					
Lecture  1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Use the instructor should be seem that the subject of the the sub		-			EE		_	•	-	-		2							
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 11 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/1387 **** 4.74 4.46 4.44 **** 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1387 **** 4.92 4.73 4.71 **** 4. Did the instructor scentribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1386 **** 4.92 4.73 4.71 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1386 **** 4.80 4.32 4.32 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1193 **** 4.68 4.02 4.05 ****  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1172 5.00 4.72 4.15 4.24 5.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	9. HOW WO						U	U	U	Т	2	2	4.20	/01/1434	4.60	4.04	4.10	4.09	4.60
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 11 0 0 1 0 0 2.00 ****/1387 **** 4.74 4.46 4.44 **** 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1387 **** 4.92 4.73 4.71 **** 4. Did the instructor scentribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1386 **** 4.92 4.73 4.71 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1386 **** 4.80 4.32 4.32 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1193 **** 4.68 4.02 4.05 ****  Discussion  Discussion  Discussion  Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1172 5.00 4.72 4.15 4.24 5.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00			Logture																
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/1387 **** 4.92 4.73 4.71 **** 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1386 **** 4.77 4.32 4.30 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1380 **** 4.80 4.32 4.30 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1380 **** 4.68 4.02 4.05 ****  *****  ******  ******  *****  ****	1 Mars +	the insta			aranarad	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2 00	**** /1207	****	171	1 16	1 11	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1386 **** 4.77 4.32 4.30 **** 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/1380 **** 4.80 4.32 4.32 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1193 **** 4.68 4.02 4.05 **** Discussion  Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1172 5.00 4.72 4.15 4.24 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1182 5.00 4.83 4.35 4.42 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1182 5.00 4.78 4.38 4.49 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1800 5.00 4.78 4.38 4.49 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1800 5.00 4.85 4.06 4.12 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.0							-	-	_		-	0		,					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1380 **** 4.80 4.32 4.32 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1193 **** 4.68 4.02 4.05 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1193 **** 4.68 4.02 4.05 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/1193 **** 4.68 4.02 4.05 **** 5. Did audiovisual techniques in the property of the pr		d the instructor seem interested in the subject										0		,					
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1172 5.00 4.72 4.15 4.24 5.00  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1182 5.00 4.83 4.35 4.42 5.00  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1170 5.00 4.78 4.38 4.49 5.00  4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1170 5.00 4.78 4.38 4.49 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  O0-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 5  28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 0  56-63 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 12 Non-major 7  84-150 3 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant											-	0		,					
Discussion  1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1172 5.00 4.72 4.15 4.24 5.00  2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1182 5.00 4.83 4.35 4.42 5.00  3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1170 5.00 4.78 4.38 4.49 5.00  4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/800 5.00 4.85 4.06 4.12 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 5  28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 0  28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 0  56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 12 Non-major 7  84-150 3 3.00-3.49 1 D 0  Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							•	-	-	_	•	•		,					****
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1172 5.00 4.72 4.15 4.24 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1182 5.00 4.83 4.35 4.42 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1170 5.00 4.78 4.38 4.49 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1170 5.00 4.78 4.38 4.49 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.0	J. Dia at	aaiovibaa	i ccciniiques em	idirec y	our understanding	11	O	O	_	O	U	U	2.00	/11/5		1.00	1.02	1.05	
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1172 5.00 4.72 4.15 4.24 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1182 5.00 4.83 4.35 4.42 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1170 5.00 4.78 4.38 4.49 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1170 5.00 4.78 4.38 4.49 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.0			Diacuas	ion															
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1182 5.00 4.83 4.35 4.42 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1170 5.00 4.78 4.38 4.49 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/800 5.00 4.85 4.06 4.12 5.00 Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors	1 Did d	lagg digo			what you learned	9	0	0	Ο	0	Ο	3	5 00	1/1172	5 00	4 72	4 15	4 24	5 00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1170 5.00 4.78 4.38 4.49 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/800 5.00 4.85 4.06 4.12 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 12 Non-major 7 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							-	-	-	-	-	-		,					
4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/800 5.00 4.85 4.06 4.12 5.00  Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 12 Non-major 7 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant														, -					
Frequency Distribution  Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors  00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 10 Required for Majors 7 Graduate 0 Major 5 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 General 0 Under-grad 12 Non-major 7 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant  I 0 Other 1			_		a open arroassion									,					
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades         Reasons         Type         Majors           00-27         2         0.00-0.99         0         A 10         Required for Majors 7         Graduate 0         Major 5           28-55         2         1.00-1.99         0         B 0           56-83         1         2.00-2.99         0         C 0         General 0         Under-grad 12 Non-major 7           84-150         3         3.00-3.49         1         D 0         Electives 1         #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant           Grad.         0         3.50-4.00         6         F 0         Electives 1         1         #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	1	opecara c	comit ques succes				Ū	·	Ü	Ü	Ü		5.00	27 000	5.00	1.00	1.00		5.00
00-27					Frequ	iency	Dis	tribu	ıtioı	n									
28-55	Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	1			Туј	pe			Majors	
28-55	00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Re	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 s	7	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r r	5
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 1 D 0  Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 0			-			,								
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ge	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	7
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									3				-	
P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 1	Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		El	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	h
I 0 Other 1					P 0														
? 0					I 0		Ot:	her					1	_		3			
• •					? 0														

Course-Section: MUSC 301 01 University of Maryland
Title Chambers Players Baltimore County

Instructor: Kannen, Maria La (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 12 Spring 2010
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1044

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			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	3	9	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	170/1447	4.83	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	283/1427	4.67	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1079/1447	4.50	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	4.60	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	****	4.74	4.46	4.44	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1387	****	4.92	4.73	4.71	***
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1386	****	4.77	4.32	4.30	***
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1380	****	4.80	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	4.12	5.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 10		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	:s	7	Graduat	 e	0	 Majo	 r	5

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				2	n						

Course-Section: MUSC 303 01

Title UMBC Camerata--Chamber

Instructor: Caracciolo, Step

Enrollment: 48
Questionnaires: 36

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1045 JUN 28, 2010 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. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	5	28	4.71	353/1447	4.71	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	260/1447	4.74	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	33	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	****	4.84	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	542/1402	4.46	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	30	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1358	****	4.53	4.11	4.10	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	0	0	4	8	19	4.48	486/1427	4.48	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	262/1434	4.63	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.74	4.46	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	919/1387	4.71	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	529/1386	4.58	4.77	4.32	4.30	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	2	0	10	4.38	775/1380	4.38	4.80	4.32	4.32	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	31	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.49	****
4. Were special techniques successful	31	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	4.12	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	13	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	=			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 304 01

Title UMBC Jubilee Singers Instructor: Jackson, Janice

Enrollment: 37
Questionnaires: 26

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1046 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	ı Questi	lonna:	ire
---------	--------	------------	----------	--------	-----

					Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	 General															
1. Did you gain new		om this course	0	0	1	1	4	0	20	4.42	695/1447	4.42	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.42
2. Did the instruct	<b>J</b>		0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	238/1447	4.77	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.77
3. Did the exam que			0	14	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.84	4.33	4.33	4.75
4. Did other evalua	tions reflect the e	expected goals	0	17	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned read	dings contribute to	what you learned	2	17	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assi	gnments contribute	to what you learned	2	21	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading	system clearly expl	ained	2	5	0	1	4	1	13	4.37	644/1427	4.37	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.37
8. How many times wa	as class cancelled		2	0	0	0	0	15	9	4.38	1175/1447	4.38	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.38
9. How would you gra	ade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	296/1434	4.57	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.57
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared					0	2	1	8	4.55	741/1387	4.55	4.74	4.46	4.44	4.55
2. Did the instruct	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture mate:	rial presented and	explained clearly	15	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	353/1386	4.73	4.77	4.32	4.30	4.73
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	159/1380	4.91	4.80	4.32	4.32	4.91
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	17	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.05	****
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	559/1172	4.29	4.72	4.15	4.24	4.29
2. Were all students	s actively encourag	ed to participate	19	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	723/1182	4.29	4.83	4.35	4.42	4.29
3. Did the instruct	nd open discussion	20	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.49	****	
4. Were special tech	. Were special techniques successful					0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	4.12	***
	E						n									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	ıs			Туј	pe			Majors	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	1	А	19	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	26	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 305 01 University of Maryland Page 1047 Title UMBC Community Symphon Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Richards, Edwin

Enrollment: 47 Questionnaires: 47

# Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	0	6	38	4.78	287/1447	4.78	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	7	37	4.84	162/1447	4.84	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	33	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	****/1241	****	4.84	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	27	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	150/1402	4.82	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	38	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1358	****	4.53	4.11	4.10	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	ed 3	40	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	12	0	0	3	4	24	4.68	274/1427	4.68	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	3	41	4.93	339/1447	4.93	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ss 3	0	0	0	0	2	42	4.95	44/1434	4.95	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	35	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	36	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	****/1386	****	4.77	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	****/1380	****	4.80	4.32	4.32	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	36	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1193	***	4.68	4.02	4.05	***
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1182	****	4.83	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	n 43	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.49	***
4. Were special techniques successful	43	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.85	4.06	4.12	****
Fr	equenc	y Di	strik	outio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade	es			Re	asons	S			Ту	pe			Majors	ı
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 31		 R	 equir	ed f	or Ma	 ajor	 s 1	. 2	Graduat	 e	0	Majc	 or	23

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	А	31	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	24
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	14	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				?	1						

Baltimore County

University of Maryland Page 1048 JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Course-Section: MUSC 307 06

8

Small Ensemble

Goldstein, Thoma

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

	Questions						Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did voi	ı gəin ne	General w insights,skil		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	4 51	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00
-	_	w insignes,skii tor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447		4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00
		estions reflect			0	7	0	0	0	0	1		****/1241		4.84	4.33	4.33	****
		ations reflect			0	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402		4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00
				what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1358		4.53	4.11	4.10	5.00
	_	-		what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	expla:	ined -	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	4.61	4.53	4.19	4.15	5.00
8. How mar	ny times v	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	4.90	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overal	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	158/1434	4.52	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.75
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lectures		prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00
		tor seem intere			6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387		4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
				xplained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	what	you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1380	4.75	4.80	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	4.05	****
	Discussion																	
1 5 1 1	Discussion  . Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	•	0	0	0	F 00	1 /11 0	4 55	4 50	4 15	4 0 4	F 00
					6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1172		4.72	4.15	4.24	5.00
				d to participate d open discussion	6 6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182 1/1170		4.83 4.78	4.35	4.42 4.49	5.00 5.00
		chniques succes		a open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	,	4.25	4.78	4.38	4.49	
4. Were at	peciai ce	cimiques succes	ssiui		U	U	U	U	U	U	2	3.00	1/ 000	1.75	1.03	1.00	7.12	3.00
		Seminar																
	_	-		announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 66		****	4.58	4.17	****
				ividual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 62		****	4.56	4.21	****
				what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58		****	4.41	2.87	****
		ns contribute t		you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	,		****	4.42	4.01	****
5. were cr	riteria i	or grading made	e clear		7	0	0	U	U	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	: ^^^^		4.09	3.38	^^^
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utior	ı									
Credita Fa	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Res	asons				ጥ	рe			Majors	
00-27						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	5	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		_	_	,				0		,	0			6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-9	rad	8	Non-	major	2
84-150 Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	1 1	D 0 F 0		רק.	ectiv	700				0	####	Moana +	horo o	ro not	onona	h
Grad. 0 5.50-4.00 r 0					ЕТ6	=CLI\	ves			0 #### - M response						_	11	
I O					Otł	ıer					0	Tespons	CD LU L	c argii	ıııcaı			
	1 U ? 1					001						-						
				• ±														

Course-Section: MUSC 307 07
Title Small Ensemble
Instructor: Morin, Joseph C

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 5

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1049 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	723/1447	4.51	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	196/1447	4.84	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	541/1241	4.50	4.84	4.33	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	314/1402	4.83	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	680/1427	4.61	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	4.90	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left($	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	454/1434	4.52	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	659/1380		4.80	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.75	4.72	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182		4.83	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	1		1070/1170	4.25	4.78	4.38	4.49	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	195/ 800	4.75	4.85	4.06	4.12	4.50
Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Туј	pe			Majors	;
00.07														

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	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	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	1						

Course-Section: MUSC 307 10
Title Small Ensemble
Instructor: King, Thomas D.
Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 7

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1050 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	971/1447	4.51	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	292/1447	4.84	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	4.50	4.84	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1402	4.83	4.74	4.24	4.24	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	459/1427	4.61	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled			0	0	0	2	5	4.71	901/1447	4.90	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	454/1434	4.52	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	***
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1380	4.75	4.80	4.32	4.32	****

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

Course-Section: MUSC 308 01

Title UMBC Wind Ensemble

Instructor: Spece, Richard D

Enrollment: 38
Questionnaires: 31

# University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1051 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	7	12	11	4.06	1027/1447	4.06	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	22	4.65	376/1447	4.65	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1241	****	4.84	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	217/1402	4.75	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	27	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1358	****	4.53	4.11	4.10	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	28	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	140/1427	4.83	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	13	4.42	1147/1447	4.42	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	222/1434	4.68	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	217/1386	4.83	4.77	4.32	4.30	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	238/1380	4.83	4.80	4.32	4.32	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	7	0	0	0	1	4		****/1193	****	4.68	4.02	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/1172		4.72	4.15	4.24	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1182		4.83	4.35	4.42	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.49	****
Frequ	.ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

Credits Ea	arned Cum. GPA			Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	 А	28	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	В	0						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	14	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0	FIECCIVES		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-	-	-	
				2	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 319 01 Title

Adv Topics In Music Te

Instructor: Wonneberger,Ala

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 6 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1052 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	222/1447	4.83	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1241	4.83	4.84	4.33	4.33	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1125/1358	3.60	4.53	4.11	4.10	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	866/1427	4.17	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	673/1447	4.83	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1282/1387	3.67	4.74	4.46	4.44	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.80	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1022/1193	3.33	4.68	4.02	4.05	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.72	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 800	***	4.85	4.06	4.12	***

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

Course-Section: MUSC 320 01

Title UMBC Jazz Ensemble

Instructor: Belzer,Matthew
Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010 Page 1053 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1					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	2	10	4.83	222/1447	4.83	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1358	****	4.53	4.11	4.10	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	99/1427	4.89	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	436/1447	4.92	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	315/1434	4.55	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.68	4.02	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful		0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.85	4.06	4.12	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 322 01

Title Music History II

Instructor: Morin, Joseph C
Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 32

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1054 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	25	4.63	452/1447	4.63	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	25	4.63	401/1447	4.63	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	26	4.66	392/1241	4.66	4.84	4.33	4.33	4.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	2	3	2	21	4.50	494/1402	4.50	4.74	4.24	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	4	20	4.32	540/1358	4.32	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	3	1	22	4.23	644/1316	4.23	4.62	4.14	4.13	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	3	24	4.44	554/1427	4.44	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	18	4.58	1030/1447	4.58	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	5	1	14	4.45	408/1434	4.45	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	2	1	19	4.65	581/1387		4.74	4.46	4.44	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	1	1	1	19		1090/1387	4.57	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	2	2	2	17	4.48	649/1386	4.48	4.77	4.32	4.30	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	2	1	16	4.27	868/1380	4.27	4.80	4.32		4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	1	0	2	3	16	4.50	288/1193	4.50	4.68	4.02	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	496/1172	4.36	4.72	4.15	4.24	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	2	0	0	9	4.45	595/1182	4.45	4.83	4.35	4.42	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	616/1170	4.45	4.78	4.38	4.49	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	21	2	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	351/ 800	4.22	4.85	4.06	4.12	4.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.92	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	5.00	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: MUSC 322 01 Title

Music History II

Instructor: Morin, Joseph C

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 32

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1054 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	22	 Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	=			
				?	2						

Course-Section	n: MUSC 324 01	University of Maryland	Page 1055
Title	Small Ensemble Jazz Gr	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Belzer, Matthew	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	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	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.09	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	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	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	0						

Course-Section	: MUSC 324 02	University of Maryland	P
Title	Small Ensemble Jazz Gr	Baltimore County	JUN

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

4

8. How many times was class cancelled

Page 1056 N 28, 2010 Instructor: Lagana, Thomas V Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained			0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.15	5.00

0 2 5.00

1/1447 5.00 4.63 4.69 4.65 5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

#### Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MUSC 385 01 University of Maryland Title Intermediate Conductin Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Caracciolo,Step Instructor:

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 10

# Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1057

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.84	4.33	4.33	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1316	****	4.62	4.14	4.13	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	154/1427	4.80	4.53	4.19	4.15	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.63	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	93/1434	4.89	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1193	***	4.68	4.02	4.05	****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Į.
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 390 13 University of Maryland Title Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Instructor: Dunlap, Matthew Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1058

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	5 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
Quescions														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1058/1447	4.50	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1053/1447	4.50	4.78	4.27	4.23	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	849/1434	4.50	4.64	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.32	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.49	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	Туре	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	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 t	here	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to b	oe sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_	_		
				?	0						

Course-Sectio	on: MUSC 390 17	University of Maryland	Page 1059
Title	Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
		- 1 0010	- 1 0000

Course-section	11. MOSC 330 11	Unitversity of Maryland	Page 1039
Title	Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Richards, Edwin	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	1		

Questionnaires: 1

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Instr Mean	uctor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.50	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.50	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.50	4.64	4.10	4.09	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: MUSC 391 01 University of Maryland Title Adv Perf Studies - Wes Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010

Instructor: Ruas,Laura

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Spring 2010 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1060

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.09	5.00
Lecture														
	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	1 /1 207	г оо	4.74	4.46	4.44	г оо
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00				5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	-	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386		4.77	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.80	4.32	4.32	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	5.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	5.00	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	5.00	5.00
Freq	onar	Dia	t wib	1+ i 01	2									
rrequ	lency	DIS	CIID	ucloi	.1									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	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	Ĺ
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: MUSC 391 01	University of Maryland	Page 1061
Title Adv Perf Studies - Wes	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor: Franklin, Rachel	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1				
Ouestionnaires:	1	Student.	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

	Frequencies					Instructor			Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.23	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.84	4.33	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.13	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.53	4.19	4.15	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.65	5.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	<u>.</u>	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	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		
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	0	_				
				2	Λ							

Course-Section:	: MUSC 392 01	University of Maryland	Page 1062
Title	Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Yoshioka,Airi	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029

Title	Adv.Perf.Stud:Westrn A	Baltimore County	JUN 28,
Instructor:	Yoshioka,Airi	Spring 2010	Job IRB
Enrollment:	1		

Questionnaires: 1

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	-	ncies 3		5	Instr Mean	uctor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course  2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals  8. How many times was class cancelled  9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0 0 0	0	0 0 0	0	0	1 1	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	1/1447 1/1447 1/1447 1/1434	5.00 5.00	4.78 4.63	4.27 4.69	4.23 4.65	5.00 5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section	: MUSC 400 03	University of Maryland	Page 1063
Title	Special Projects	Baltimore County	JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:	Morin,Joseph C	Spring 2010	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	1		

Furoriment.	1			
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course	Evaluation Questionnair	е

	Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Instr Mean	uctor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new in	nsights,skills f	rom this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.31	5.00
8. How many times was	class cancelled	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade	e the overall te	aching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.17	5.00
Fre					ribu	utior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: MUSC 400 04 Title Special Projects Hawley JR, Thoma Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 1

1

University of Maryland Page 1064 Baltimore County JUN 28, 2010 Spring 2010 Job IRBR3029

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

			Frequencies		3	Inst		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	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.63	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.17	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.51	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.60	5.00
Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	ution	า									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	Reasons Type					
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	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	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant		
				I	0	Other	0	-				
				2	Λ							

Course-Section: MUSC 401 03

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Title Special Projects: Comp Instructor: Dusman,Linda J

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 3

Page 1065 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

_			_	
Ctudont	Courac	Evaluation	Outletten	2120
Scudenc	Course	Evaluation	Ouescioni	атте

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1		1/1447		4.76	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2		529/1358		4.53	4.11	4.15	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2		1/1316	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.15	5.00
	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1202/1447	4.33	4.63	4.14	4.72	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	-	-	0	0	0	2	_	4.33	,					
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	U	U	U	Τ	2	4.6/	230/1434	4.67	4.64	4.10	4.17	4.6/
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.74	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.77	4.32	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1380		4.80		4.34	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.72	4.15	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.83	4.35	4.49	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.78	4.38	4.51	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.60	5.00

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	2	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	3	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: MUSC 427 01

Electronic Music

Title Instructor: Rubin,Anna I

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 10

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1066 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Questions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did yo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1007/1447	4.10	4.75	4.31	4.43	4.10
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	xpected goals	0	0	0	2	4	1	3	3.50	1323/1447	3.50	4.78	4.27	4.31	3.50
3. Did th	ne exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	872/1241	4.11	4.84	4.33	4.41	4.11
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	1	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1153/1402	3.78	4.74	4.24	4.34	3.78
				what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1084/1358	3.67	4.53	4.11	4.15	3.67
6. Did wr	ritten as:	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	2	3	3.30	1212/1316	3.30	4.62	4.14	4.27	3.30
		g system clearl		ained	0	1	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1356/1427	3.11	4.53	4.19	4.20	3.11
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.63	4.69	4.72	4.90
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1269/1434	3.43	4.64	4.10	4.17	3.43
	Lecture Were the instructor's lectures well prepared																	
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1235/1387	3.88	4.74	4.46	4.48	3.88
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	604/1387	4.88	4.92	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly bid the lectures contribute to what you learned				2	0	2	1	1	3	1	3.00	1328/1386	3.00	4.77	4.32	4.34	3.00
4. Did th					2	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1276/1380	3.38	4.80	4.32	4.34	3.38
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	593/1193	4.13	4.68	4.02	4.00	4.13
	Discussion																	
1. Did cl	id class discussions contribute to what you learned				7	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1090/1172	3.00	4.72	4.15	4.25	3.00
2. Were a	Were all students actively encouraged to participate			ed to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1182	4.67	4.83	4.35	4.49	4.67
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage	fair an	nd open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	710/1170	4.33	4.78	4.38	4.51	4.33
		Labora	tory															
1. Did th	ne lab in	crease understa	nding o	of the material	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.74	****
2. Were y	ou provi	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.61	****
3. Were n	necessary	materials avai	lable i	for lab activities	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.72	****
4. Did th	ne lab in	structor provid	e assis	stance	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.59	****
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	elf-paced	system contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.92	4.72	4.80	****
2. Did st	udy ques	tions make clea	r the e	expected goal	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were y	our cont	acts with the i	nstruct	cor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.60	****
	Free				iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons	:			Ту	pe			Majors	5
00-27						 mir	ed f	or Ma	iore		 5	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 nr	7	
28-55					1000	7 A T T (	cu I	J. 1-10	. ,	_	5	Graduat	_	•	1.101		,	
56-83				Ger	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	LO	Non-	-major	3		
84-150					501	c. u	-				5	011461 -9			14011		5	
Grad.					E14	ecti	ves				3	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh	
craa.	J	3.30 1.00	-	P 0								_	respons				_	,
						O+1	ner					0	LCDPOID	-2 CO L	,c bigi	cai		
I 0				OCI						J								
? 0																		

Course-Section: MUSC 480 01 Univers Title Topic in Music, Art & Balt

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2010

Instructor: Dusman, Linda J

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 6

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1067 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

<u>.</u>					Fre	auen	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	1	NA	1	-		4	5				_			Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course $0$ $0$ $0$ $1$ $0$ $5$ $4.67$ $408/1447$ $4.67$ $4.75$ $4.31$ $4.43$ $4.67$		0		0	0	0	1	0	_	1 67	400/1447	1 67	4 75	1 21	1 12	1 67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 1 0 1 4 4.33 766/1447 4.33 4.78 4.27 4.31 4.33		-		-	0	1	Τ	1	2		/					4.67
		-		-	0	Ţ	-	T	4							4.33
The state of the s	-	•			0	•	1	•	1		,					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 494/1402 4.50 4.74 4.24 4.34 4.50		-			0	0	Ţ	1	4		. ,					
					0	Τ	0	Τ	4							4.33
	-			-	U	0	0	2	4		,					4.67
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				-	•	1	1	2	2		- ,					3.83
					0	0	0	_	4		,					4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1434 5.00 4.64 4.10 4.17 5.00	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4		0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.17	5.00
Lecture	Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 3 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 566/1387 4.67 4.74 4.46 4.48 4.67	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3		0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.74	4.46	4.48	4.67
		3		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00				4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 431/1386 4.67 4.77 4.32 4.34 4.67	<u> </u>				0		-	1	2		,					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 463/1380 4.67 4.80 4.32 4.34 4.67					n	-	-	1	2		- ,					
				-	n	0	0	1	1		,					4.50
J. Did audiovisual techniques emante your understanding 4 0 0 0 1 1 4.30 200/11/3 4.30 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	-		U	U	U	U			1.50	200/1193	1.50	1.00	1.02	1.00	1.50
Discussion	Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1172 **** 4.72 4.15 4.25 ****	. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	4.72	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/1182 **** 4.83 4.35 4.49 ****	. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	***	4.83	4.35	4.49	****
				0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.78	4.38	4.51	****
				0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 800	***	4.85	4.06	4.19	****

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

Course-Section:	MUSC 492 02
Title	Senior Project
Instructor:	Morin, Joseph C
Enrollment:	1

Questionnaires: 1

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1068 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Cou	urse Evaluat	ion Onestic	nnaire

			Fre	quer	ncies	5		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.31	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	4.50	4.63	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.17	5.00

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

Course-Section: MUSC 492 03
Title Senior Project
Instructor: Rubin,Anna I
Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

### University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 1069 JUN 28, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Fvaluation	Ouestionnair
Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestronnari

			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	1/1447	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.78	4.27	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.34	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1361/1447	4.50	4.63	4.69	4.72	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.17	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.92	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.60	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 20	5.00	5.00	4.60	5.00	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 15	5.00	5.00	4.61	5.00	5.00

Credits Earned Cum.		Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	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	#### - Means there are no		
				P	0			responses to be significant		gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				2	Λ						